Truth further Defended,

AND

William Penn Vindicated;

BEING A

REJOYNDER

TO A

BOOK

ENTITULED,

A Brief and Modeſt Reply, *to Mr.* Penn's *Tedious, Scurrilous, and Unchriſtian Defence, againſt the Biſhop of* Cork.

Wherein that Author's Unfairneſs is Detected, his Arguments and Objections are Anſwered.

By *T. W.* and *N. H.*

They are of thoſe that Rebel againſt the Light, they know not the ways thereof, nor abide in the Paths thereof. Job. 24. 13.

——— *In the Net which they hid, is their own Foot taken.* Pſal. 9. 15.

Printed in the Year, 1700.

BOOK

DEVONSHIRE HOUSE
Friends Reference Library.
BISHOPSGATE WITHOUT E.C.

THE PREFACE.

FRIENDLY READER,

WE *Can assure thee, it is not agreeable to our inclinations to concern our selves in matters of Controversie, more especially in Print: But the defence of Truth, the Vindication of our abused Principles and Friends in general, with our Absent Friend in particular,* &c. *prevail'd upon us, to undertake the following Rejoynder, in Answer to a Book wrote in this City, Entituled:* A Brief and Modest Reply to Mr. *Penn's* Tedious, Scurrilous and Unchristian Defence against the Bp. of *Cork,* &c. *To which Book, tho the Authour has not Subscribed his Name, yet we conceive him to be* Edward Wettenhall *Late Bp. of* Cork. (1st.) *Because we are certainly informed he ordered the Printing, and caused the same to be Published.* (2ly.) *It is not only called and allowed by all to be his,* (*so far as we have heard*) *but confirmed so to be, in Crying about the streets of* Dublin, *and* Cork. (3ly.) *The Book it self puts it out of Question to be his, or don by a person to whom he dictated, which is observable*

throughout the same, and so particularly to be noted, in the very Introduction. Likewise in (p. 3.) *speaks of a Book of* W. P's. *then before him: These Reasons having induced us to conclude him the Authour, we have therefore in our following Discourse Styled him so.*

We observe the Bp. in the Title of his Book Applies, Brevity and Modesty *to his own account, but the blackning Epithets, of* Tediousness, Scurrillity, and Unchristianity *to* W. P's. *To which we Answer,* (1st.) *That the Bp's. Reply is brief we grant* (*as we have observed*) *and so Brief too, that we* (*shall not determin, but*) *leave it to the Reader to judge, whether it deserves the Name of a Reply. But if styling his Reply Brief, and* W. P's. Defence *Tedious, will plead Excuse for its being so short of an Answer, we allow the Bp. has made an advantage thereby.* (2ly.) *As to its Modesty, we will here give a few of the many Instances we could bring, and let the Reader judg, If charging the Quakers, with* Sleight, Cunning, Craftiness, Lying in Wait to deceive, (*a Character for the worst of men,*) *as in* (p. 1st) *If Calling the Testimony of our Friends, to the Light of Christ Jesus within Men, according to Holy Scriptures,* The Poisonous Pill of their Light within, (*Page* 13.) *Making* W. P. *a* Diffuser of Poison, (*Page* 18.) *Charging the Quakers,* (*most uncharitably*) *with being* so intent upon minding

minding worldly gain both Day and Night, as to pass most Days in the Week without a Prayer to God, either in Publick Assembly or Family, (page 21.) *Suggesting that* W. P. *is* Popishly Affected, or has a Kindness for Atheism, *because he is for a Free Gospel Ministry, and pleads against a Compelled or Forced Maintenance for them,* (Page 25.) *If these Expressions, with abundance more of the same kind, through his Reply,* (*too tedious to Mention here,*) *be either Modest upon* W. P. *in particular, or the Quakers in general, we are to learn what Modesty means. And if the Bp.* (*upon second consideration, shall still*) *think them so, we may take leave to tell him, we are no more obliged to him for his Modesty, then to his Charity,* (3ly.) *As to* W. P's. *being Scurrilous and Unchristian in his Defence; we say, If bare charges were to pass for Proofs, he might be thought guilty of both; but if demonstration be required for Proofs, as well as charges, we appeal to the Reader, and let him be judg, whether they will not rather fall upon the Bp. while we believe, he will find no such scurrilous and Unchristian Treatment, in* W. P's. Defence *as are in the Bp's.* Reply.

We also observe, That altho the Bp's. Reply *is Dated,* Cork, March, 21. 169$\frac{8}{9}$. *at which time, he was not removed hence, Yet we have*

no

no reaſon aſſigned wherefore it was not Printed, or made Publick till October, 1699. *What Reaſons, the Bp. had for delaying its Publication, he beſt knows: But this we know, that* W. P. *ſailed for* Penſilvania *in* September, *and ſoon after out came the Bp's.* Reply. *Had* W. P. *continued in* England *the delay had been no blame upon the Bp. but ſince the Bp. had made ſeveral perſonal Reflections and Charges againſt* W.P. *which none could Anſwer, ſo well as himſelf, we think he ought to have Publiſhed his Reply, before* W.P's. *departure for* America, *(ſince he had time enough for ſo doing) That ſo* W. P. *might have appeared in his own Vindication, and which he could eaſily have done, had the* Bp's, Reply, *come out in due time: But ſince the Bp. thought not fit ſo to do, whereby this* Rejoynder *hath fallen into the Hands of Perſons, leſs skilful in the Defence of Truth then* W. P. *(as we freely confeſs it hath,) and not ſo qualified to Treat the Bp. as* W.P. *nor perhaps, as the Bp. himſelf might expect. The Bp. may be pleaſed, or diſpleaſed with himſelf, as he finds occaſion, for depriving* W. P. *of that ſervice, and thereby (to be ſure) himſelf of an Abler Opponent. But tho the Bp. ſhould diſlike us for Opponents, yet we think he cannot (at leaſt ought not) to blame us, (ſince Reaſon and Juſtice allows us the Priviledge) to appear in our Juſt Vindication, when we find our Principles, as well as our*

Friends,

Friends, ſo greatly Abuſed, Miſrepreſented, and Reflected upon, as we believe will plainly appear (to the Impartial Reader,) they are in the Bp's. Reply: *However, notwithſtanding his Treatment, tho we may be plain, where the Nature of his Charges extorts it from us, yet we hope the Reader will find, that we have not only endeavoured to carry our ſelves, with that Moderation towards him, which becomes us both as Men and Chriſtians too: But likewiſe as fair Opponents, having deſignedly, neither Perverted his Words, nor Miſrepreſented his Sence, ſo far as we underſtood them; and whether we have thus done on our Parts, or the Bp. hath done the contrarry by* W. P. *is left to the Impartial Reader.*

To Conclude, The following Rejoynder *was Writ laſt Winter, according to its Date at the End, and as a Reaſon for its lying ſo long Unprinted, the Reader may pleaſe to underſtand, That being adviſed by a Friend from* Dublin, *above Eight Months paſt, he had ſent One of the Bp's.* Reply's, *by way of* Mary-Land *to* W. P. *it gave us ſome hopes of an Anſwer thereto, from himſelf, which we greatly deſired. But inaſmuch, as ſome Letters, hath been very lately received from* W. P. *and that he makes no mention of that* Reply, *we now conclude it has Miſcarried; Therefore to the end we may no longer remain Silent, under the Bp's. Charges and Reflections, &c. We have thought fit at laſt*

laſt, (tho late,) to make this Publick, and the rather becauſe we have heard, ſome have conceived an Opinion, That the Bp's. Reply *was Unanſwerable.*

Cork the 20*th* of the 7*th* Month, 1700.

Thomas Wight.
Nicholas Harris.

Advertiſement.

READER, pleaſe to mind, that there are Two Impreſſions of *W. P's. Defence* Extant: The Citations in this Diſcourſe, reſpects the Second, very few of the Firſt being in *Ireland.* But the Bps. Citations, chiefly Reſpects the Firſt.

DEVONSHIRE HOUSE
Friends Reference Library
BISHOPSGATE WITHOUT

A Rejoynder to a Book, Stiled, A Brief and Modest Reply to Mr. *Penn's, &c.*

THE Bishop seems pleased with *William Penn* for Printing *Gospel Truths*, together with his *Testimony* before his own Defence, and begins his Introduction thus, (P. 1) *The Bp. of* Cork *being to vindicate the Truth and Himself, thanks* Mr. P. *for having Printed both his own Paper and the Bp's. Testimony against it at length before his Book; for the Bp. believes that all sober and Reasonable Christians who shall read those two over and consider them, will easily acquit the Bp. from the first of* Mr. P's. *Imputations in his Preface, that he is a man of a mind different from those, who would have strife among Christians abated, and for discouraging Controversies in Religion.*

Answ. Evident then it is, *W. P.* was careful to set the whole matter fairly before his Reader, that so he might be able to make the better Judgment, and we wish the Bp. had as well deserved thanks from *W.P.* for setting down the Defence (tho' not

at length yet) in its due ſtrength, without ſuppreſſing ſo conſiderable a part of it and perverting ſo much of the reſt, as will be found he hath done. Next we are equally agreed to refer *W. P's.* Imputation to all ſober and reaſonable Chriſtians, believing they will not ſo eaſily acquit the Bp. as he thinks, conſidering he was the only Perſon in *Ireland*, who broke out into a Publick Teſtimony againſt that Inoffenſive Paper called *Goſpell Truths*, and therein greatly abuſed us, as *W. P.* hath plainly ſhewn in many Inſtances from Page 22 to 26 of his Defence, but ſlipt over by the Bp. with ſaying, *To Omit things leſs Material*; as if ſo egregiouſly to abuſe and villifie a People, as he is there charged by *W. P.* to have done, were a light matter with him. And farther to ſpeak our Sentiments (after the Bp's. way) Let *W. P's.* Defence and the Bp's. Reply be read over and conſidered by all Sober and Impartial Chriſtians, and we cannot but believe they will be of our mind, for the ſakes of ſuch only there was no need of this Rejoynder; that Defence being (as we think) a ſufficient Anſwer of it ſelf to the moſt material parts of the Bp's. Reply.

The Bp. proceeds thus. (ibid 1) *the Bp. ſays a peaceable Teſtimony againſt the ſlight of men, touching whom it is queſtionable, whether they be Chriſtians or not, and againſt their*

their cunning craftineſs who lye in wait to deceive, is no moving ſtrife or raiſing quarrels among Chriſtians.

Anſw. As to the peaceableneſs of the Bp's. Teſtimony his management therein, doth evidently ſhew it, and which we leave to the Impartial Reader: But if Miſrepreſenting, Abuſing, and Calling us no Chriſtians; if obtruding Principles upon us as ours which we utterly diſown and abhor; if drawing Conſequences from our Words & Writings, we never thought of, much leſs intended, and forcing them upon us, tho we diſclaim them; if curtailing our Writings, leaving out what explained our meaning, and wilfuly overlooking our plain Senſe, with much more too tedious to mention, would make it queſtionable, whether we are Chriſtians or not, the Bp. is in the right: Nay we will go farther with him; it would not only be queſtionable, but we had without all peradventure been poſitively made no Chriſtians; for it hath been the conſtant practice of our Adverſaries (ſince we were a People) thus to deal by us, and amongſt the reſt, we cannot excuſe the Bp. from having a ſhare in ſome of theſe things, which ſhall be ſhewn in their places. But bleſſed be God, 'tis not the Tongues or Pens of all our Adverſaries in the World, can make us no Chriſtians; for we have not only believed

in the outward coming and appearance of our Lord *Jeſus Chriſt* in the Fleſh with his Sufferings, Death, Reſurrection, Aſſention and Mediation, but in humility of Soul and to the praiſe of his Holy Name, we can ſay we have witneſſed his ſecond coming in Spirit, according to his promiſe, *John* 14. 17, 81. *Chap.* 15. 26. and 16. 13. to fit and prepare our Souls in order to obtain the benefit of his outward death and ſufferings for us. And thus we are not only Chriſtians by Notion and Tradition but ſuch in reallity, for which we have the evidence in our ſelves according to 1 *John* 5. 10. *He that believeth on the Son of God hath the witneſs in himſelf. And* Rom. 8. 16. *The Spirit it ſelf beareth witneſs with our Spirits, that we are the Children of God.* Here then is the double and agreeing record of true Religion, the Illumination of the holy Ghoſt within, agreeing with the Teſtimony of the Scriptures of Truth without, which we ſhall have farther occaſion to ſpeak to. But here, that we may not be miſunderſtood, we do not mean ſo largely of all ſuch as ſome may call Quakers, but of ſuch whoſe Lives and Converſations influenced by the Holy Spirit beſpeak them to be true Quakers and therefore true Chriſtians.

Next as to the Bp's. groſs, (and to uſe his own Words) *ſcurrilous and unchriſtian* charge of

of *ſlight*, *cuning*, *craftinneſs*, *lying in wait to deceive*, which is brought as a confirming charge to his Teſtmony, in which he told us and tells again (*P.* 9) he did not judge us: We ſay as to this charge, we ſhall not at preſent ſay much, (reſerving it to be conſidered with more of the ſame kind) only tell the Bp. That as we know not how he will reconcile this to modeſty, ſo we hope he will not ſay again, he don't judge us, while if what he ſays were true (whether it reſpect our Principles or our Morals) we think 'tis plain he equally judges us to be the worſt and baſeſt of Men; the Bp. Proceeds,

(P. 1.) *Mr.* P. *adds he gave his Paper to the Bp. in a private way, at a friendly viſit upon his own deſire. This is what the Bp. Called writing in ſuch a way that is hard to know what is meant. If Mr.* P. *means that either he gave the Paper to the Bp. upon the Bp's. Deſire, or made that Viſit upon the Bp's. Deſire, in both Senſes the ſaying is utterly falſe, for both the Viſit and the Paper were a Surprize, and altogether unexpected by the Bp. Thus the Bp.* (*P.* 1 *and* 2) *Anſw.* 1*ſt.* As to the Paper, take the words as they lye in *W. P's.* Preface (*P.* 1) which runs thus ('Given 'him by me in a Private way at a Friendly 'Viſit upon his own deſire.) Conſidering the Order of the words, we believe any Impartial Reader will conclude the Bp's. deſire was

relative to the Viſit, not the Paper; but waving that, ſee but about ten lines farther and the matter will be paſt doubt, where *W. P.* Speaks thus, '*I did Indeed, perceiving him converſant in our Writings, & his Character moderation, caſually preſent him with one of theſe Papers.* Again, at the end of the Preface *W. P.* ſpeaking of the Paper ſays *given him.* Now Reader judg in the matter, Can any thing be plainer, then that the Paper was *W. P's.* Preſent, and not given at the Bp's. Deſire. From whence we conclude, that either the Bp's. over eager deſire for an advantage againſt the Quakers, made him fall into this miſtake, or he thought it might paſs with his unwary Reader, as a Confirmation of his former Charge, about the Quakers way of Writing. But now ſince the Bp. is ſo Critical about Words, may not we with more reaſon and juſtice return the Charge upon himſelf, where he ſays, *This is what the Bp. called Writing in ſuch a way that is hard to know what is meant.* Whereas what the Bp. ſaid in his *Teſtimony* before, runs thus, *You have ſuch a way of Writing and Speaking that it is very hard, in many matters of Religion, to know what you mean*; So that 'twas matters of Religion he then ſpoke of; but that which he now applies, this way of Writing and Speaking to, is not matter of Religion,

Religion, but a meer circumſtance of *W. P's.* viſiting the Bp. upon the Bp's. Deſire, or not; ſo to put the beſt conſtruction upon this miſtake, the Bp. forgot himſelf when he ſaid, *This is what the Bp. called Writing in ſuch a way, &c.* But (2dly) Suppoſing we ſhould let it go, as the Bp. would have it, he will ſtill be in no better a caſe, for the word [this,] the Bp. makes to intend *W. P's.* Words in his Defence relating to the Paper and Viſit, and thoſe words [what] and [called] reſpect the time paſt, and related to what the Bp. has charged the Quakers withal in his *Teſtimony* about their way of Writing, *&c.* How then, ſay we could any Words in the Bp's. *Teſtimony* be relative to *W. P's.* Defence, which was writ afterwards, and was an Anſwer to that *Teſtimony*. Thus, Reader, ſee how the Bp. falls into the ſame fault, he would have charged upon *W. P.* and the Quakers. We had not thus troubled thee, Reader, about Words, but the Bp. gave the occaſion, and we were willing to let thee ſee, how ready the Bp. is (amongſt the reſt of our Adverſaries) to charge and condemn us without ground, while the fault is in themſelves, and yet this is little to what will appear hereafter in the Bp. Next as to the Viſit, the Bp. denies he deſired it, and charges *W. P.* with an utter falſhood;

but he would have done well to have Exhibited this, with others of his Perſonal Charges and Reflections, before *W. P.* went for *America*, that ſo he might have Anſwered for himſelf; However, as it happens, we can in this Caſe, ſay ſomething in the defence of *W. P.* and muſt ſay, we believe the Bp. to be forgetful; for *Amos Strettell* of *Dublin*, being at *Cork* while *W. P.* was here, and hapning to be in company with him and *Joſeph Pike*, at the Houſe of the ſaid *Pike*, at a time, when *G. R.* came to viſit *W. P.* they the ſaid *Strettell* and *Pike*, heard *G. R.* ſay to *W. P.* That the Bp. had a great deſire to ſee him, and deſired him to bring him to his Houſe, to which *W. P.* agreed, when a convenient ſeaſon offered. Thus much the ſaid *Strettell* and *Pike* remembers, and are ready to give under their Hands, if deſired; and 'tis believed *G. R.* himſelf cannot forget it, whom we know, and is known to be a Perſon of that Character and Station, in the World, that would ſcorn to forge ſuch a Story to *W. P.* However it accidentally hapned *G. R.* did not accompany him, as deſigned, in that Viſit occaſioned by *W. P's.* dining at a Houſe, which lay not far from the Bp's. He thence took the oportunity of Viſiting the Bp. in company with two other Perſons. We find

the

the Bp. confeſſeth, *He had a little Curioſity, which might paſs for a Deſire*, to ſee *W. P.* (whom he jeeringly calls *King of Penſilvania*) as he would have been deſirous to ſee the *Pope, or the Great Turk, or any other great Man of Sin*; This we find he remembers, and we may be ſo Charitable as to believe he forgot the other. To conclude this point about the Viſit: If the Bp. hath conceived any diſlike againſt *W. P.* for puting it in Print, either becauſe it might be a Scandal to the Bp. in regard, *W. P.* is a Quaker, or that he thought *W. P.* might thereby raiſe his Credit with the World, (which the Bp. would have depreſſed) we ſay if either of theſe be the Caſe, we believe he may be very eaſie in the matter; for without leſſening to the Bp. he may know many Perſons of much greater note and ſtation in the World then he (*Ireland* not excepted) have deſired to ſee and converſe with *W. P.* which as we don't believe he valued himſelf upon, leſs reaſon then had he to value himſelf upon the Bp's. deſire, and no other reaſon can we ſuppoſe *W. P.* had for Printing it, then to demonſtrate how unſuitable a return and courſe treatment the Bp. gave him for his friendly Viſit. As to the Bp's. ſuſpition of a deſign in *W. P's.* giving him the Paper, as he tells us (tho' he leaves

leaves us in the dark as to what the deſign could be.) We Anſwer, 'Twas needleſs thus to tell us now, ſince *W. P.* has told the deſign in his Preface (which was to improve the Bp's. Temper in Moderation) which the Bp. ſhould have diſproved, or told us what other deſign *W. P.* could have in preſenting him with the Paper.

(*Ibid.* 2) As to the Bp's. Jeers upon *W. P.* Calling him *King of Penſilvania*, Reproaching him with a *Spirit of Diſcerning*, and ſlily Inſinuating him among the number of *Great Men of Sin*, we ſhall ſay the leſs here, in regard we ſhall take notice thereof in another place; And as to his Margin Note, given him upon Information, that *W. P.* ſhould ſay he had *a Kingdom of his own, which was underſtod of Penſilvania.* What if the Bp's. Informer miſunderſtood *W. P*; nay, what if the whole Information was falſe, let the Reader judg whether it became the gravity of a Perſon, in the Bp's. ſtation thus to jeer upon Information. (*Ibid.* 2) Says the Bp. *And thus much as to Mr.* P's. *Preface.*

Anſw. But before we end we muſt take notice of the Bp's. ſhortneſs (not to ſay unfairneſs) in not taking notice or anſwering what followed in the Preface, which lies thus; '*Nor was it writ* (*namely* Goſpel Truths

'Truths) *for an exact and compleat account of* 'our Belief; *but occaſionaly to prevent the pre-* 'judices, *that the attempts of a courſe and ſcur-* 'rilous Pen at Dublin *juſt before might provoke* 'in *ſome againſt us. As to the points touched* 'upon in the Goſpel Truths. Thus *W. P.* Now Reader, we do not blame the Bp. barely for taking no notice of this part, but we think it became him, either to have diſproved what *W. P.* here ſaid, or not continued his Reflections now in his *Reply*, for the brevity of that Paper, while he had not only the above notice, but had alſo *Robert Barclay's Apology*, and the *Riſe and Progreſs of the People called Quakers*, which fully and clearly vindicates at large ſome of thoſe Tenets, he (now again) cenſures as ſhort expreſt in that Paper, as we ſhall ſhew in their places. But the Bp. proceeds thus,

(Ibid. 2) *The firſt charge in his Book againſt the Bp. is, that he did not prove ſuch a Reader as he profeſt himſelf, Mr.* P. *would have had him ſuch a Reader that had rather they ſhould be in the right then in the wrong; the Bp. never profeſt himſelf ſuch.*

Anſw. How will the Bp. be able to Reconcile this, to the Words, in his *Teſtimony*, where he ſays in the begining of it, *Friends, I am ſuch a Reader as in your Paper you deſire.* This in Anſwer to *Goſpel Truths*, which

which desired a *Sober Reader* in these Words, *If thou hadst rather we should be in the right then in the wrong*,&c. Manifest Contradiction.

But the Bp. to bring himself off, goes on thus,

(Ibid. 2) *Mr.* P. *desires a strange partial Reader, who should have more inclination and affection to the Quakers (that is his Adversaries) Opinion then his own, or who would rather be in an Error himself then that his Adversaries should be in any.*

Answ. Is there no difference betwen desiring a People were in the Right then in the Wrong, and between chusing rather that Himself were in the Wrong then his Adversaries should be so; certainly a great deal, and it looks as if the Bp. were hard put to it, when he thus argueth, Did *W. P.* intend or desire such a Reader as the Bp. stateth? No, but such an one that had rather we were in the Right then in the Wrong, and explains it thus; 'One that thought it 'but reasonable we should be Heard before 'Condemned, and that our Belief ought to 'be taken from our own Mouths and not 'at theirs, that hath prejudged our Cause. In short 'tis very plain, he only desired an Impartial Reader, such as the Bp. only pretended to be.

(*Ibid.* 2) The Bp. tells us, He neither had nor has any personal quarrel with *W. P.*

W. P. But, ſays the Bp. all he impleads him of (meaning *W. P.*) *is his Doctrine, by ſpreading and defending ſuch Principles which tend to the Subverting Chriſtianity, at which no Bp. ought to connive.*

Anſw. As this is only a general as well as a falſe charge, ſo needs no other Anſwer here but a poſitive denial, until we come to particulars, where we ſhall ſee how well the Bp. will prove his Charge. As to his not conniving, to be ſure he's at his liberty to implead, but if he ſhould do ſo again, we muſt deſire him to approve himſelf a fairer Adverſary, then he hath yet appeared, either in his *Teſtimony* or now in his *Reply.*

(*P.* 2) Says the Bp. *To omit things leſs material,* (*P.* 24) *He would inſinuate the Bp. Guilty of Inſincerity in ſaying it was the firſt time he ever heard the Quakers own the Neceſſity of Chriſt as a Propitiation in order to Remiſſion of Sins, and juſtifying them as Sinners from the guilt, and tells the Bp. where poſſibly he might have read it.* The Bp. makes Anſwer thus, *Poſſibly the Bp. may have Read more then either he did or now does actually remember, he never had ſo much as many of the Quakers Books, much leſs has he them in his memory.*

Anſw. Here is firſt an Inſtance of the brevity of the Bp's. Reply, while he takes a large

a large ſtride from (*P.* 20) to (24) where *W. P.* Enumerates and Charges the Bp. with unfair dealing by us, which the Bp. paſſeth over without notice, with ſaying, *to omit things leſs Material*; next as *W. P.* ſaid, ſo ſay we, that 'tis next to impoſſible it ſhould be the firſt time, he ſo heard of the Quakers, ſince he had read *R. Barclays Apology*, which largely treats of this head: But the Bp. Confeſſeth he poſſibly may have Read more then he Remembers, which ſeems a tacit granting the matter. But ſuppoſe he did not actually remember this point, can it be poſſible he ſhould forget that he had Read any of the Quakers Books ſince he told *W. P.* ſo very lately, he had Read *Robert Barclay*, and his Book called the *Riſe and Progreſs of the Quakers*; the former largely, and the latter as fully as now in *Goſpel Truths*, owning the Doctrine of Juſtification.——Whence it follows, if the Bp. had been an Impartial Reader, as he pretended, and one that was unwilling to repreſent us wrong, or render us defective in our Belief, he would certainly have firſt ſearched thoſe two Books before he had made this point a new diſcovery; ſo to the Impartial Reader we refer the Bp's. ſincerity or kindneſs to the Quakers herein, and Proceed,

(*Ibid.*

(*Ibid.* 3) The Bp. tells us, *That he has a Book now before him, Intitled,* The ſecond Part of the ſerious Apology for the Principles and Practices of the People called Quakers, by *W. P.* Printed 1671. *In which* (P. 148.) *are theſe Words; This* [*namely Juſtification by the Righteouſneſs which Chriſt hath fulfilled in his own Perſon for us in the Words before*] *We deny, and boldly affirm it to be the Doctrine of Devils, and an Arm of the Sea of Corruption, which does now deluge the whole World.* (Then the Bp. adds) *This the Bp. does not underſtand to be owning Juſtification by Chriſt, he therefore now was glad to find* Mr. P. *more Orthodox in* 1698. *Then he was in* 1671.

Anſw. We would have been alſo glad to have found the Bp. more fair and ingenious, not to ſay worſe (which it will bear), then to leave out the Explanatory Part of *W. P's.* Words, which is as far Remote from a fair Adverſary as an Impartial Reader: Whereas had he been ſo juſt as to leave them in, tho' they would not have ſuited the Bp's. purpoſe, yet (together with *W.P's.* plain Senſe in ſeveral following Arguments) would have made *W. P.* as Orthodox (to the Impartial Reader) in 1671. As the Bp. allows him to be 1698.—— For next to the Words (*i e*) *His own Perſon for us,* follow theſe Words (*wholy without*

without us) which Words the Bp. hath wholly left out, and inſtead of them hath ſubſtituted theſe Words [*in the Words before*] and the Bp. hath not only thus done, but hath as we believe wilfully overlooked (ſince the place was before him) *W. P's.* plain ſenſe and meaning in his foregoing Words in the ſame Page, which are theſe, 'For in him [namely in Chriſt] 'We have Life, and by Faith Atonement in 'his Blood. And the like he hath done in what followed in the *Apology*, which we ſhall preſently ſhew; But firſt we ſhall ſet down the intire Words as they lye in that *Apology* (which the Bp. pretends to cite, and by which the Reader will ſee the Bp's. great unfairneſs) which were at firſt the Words of an Adverſary one *Jenner*, and cited by *W. P.* with other Articles, thus (*Pag.* 148.) 5th. *That we deny Juſtification by the Righteouſneſs which Chriſt hath fulfilled in his own Perſon for us (wholly without us) and therefore deny the Lord that Bought us*: To which *W. P.* gives his Adverſary an Anſwer thus, 'And indeed this we deny, and 'boldly affirm it in the Name of the Lord to 'be the Doctrine of Devils, and an Arm of 'the Sea of Coruption, which does now de-'luge the whole World. Upon this *W. P.* proceeds to vindicate his Negation; firſt ſaying, that his Friend and Partner *G. W.*

in

in writing that *Apology* had already irrefutably considered the Doctrine of Justification, and therefore he will not insist so much upon this Point as he had upon others, and only adds some short Arguments by which he proves that Wicked and Ungodly Men (while so) are not in a state of Justification and Acceptance with God, by the imputed Righteousness of Christ, and confirms the same by several Scripture Arguments; and then on the other hand shews that such only are truly justified, who are obedient unto the Spirit of God, by which they become the Children of God, and bring forth fruits of Holiness; and in confirmation hereof gives us these Scripture Texts. *Gal.* 6. *Ro.* 8. *Reve.* 22. And after having shewn, who are not, and who are in a state of Justification and Acceptance with God, he is so far from denying Justification by Christ, that he owns, ascribes, and asserts the same alone to him, which for the Readers satisfaction we shall cite his Words as they lie in that *Apology* following the above Arguments, *p.* 149. thus; 'We do believe in 'one holy God Almighty, who is an Eternal 'Spirit, the Creator of all things, and in 'one Lord Jesus Christ, his only Son and 'express Image, of his substance, who took 'upon him Flesh, and was in the World, and 'in Life, Doctrine, Miracles, Death, Re-

'ſurection, Aſcention, & Mediation, perfect-
'ly did and does continue to do the will of
'God, to whoſe holy Life, Power, Medi-
'ation and Blood, we only aſcribe our
'*Sanctification*, *Juſtification*, *Redemption*, and
'perfect *Salvation*.

Now, Impartial Reader, judg between the Bp. and *W. P.* whether *W. P.* did deny Juſtification by Chriſt, as the Bp. would inſinuate; and whether the Bp. was led by a Chriſtian Spirit while he dealt ſo very unfairly, what if we ſay unjuſtly by *W. P.* in miſrepreſenting his Senſe to make him ſo intend (as we have before noted.) Now as to the Doctrine of Juſtification we ſhall not be large thereon, in regard many of our Friends have treated upon that head, and particularly (beſides *W. P.* in ſeveral Tracts of his) our deceaſed friend *R. Barclay* in his *Apology* hath writ excellently and fully thereof: As alſo that the Bp. hath allowed *W. P.* to be Orthodox in what is written in *Goſpel Truths* upon that Point; for theſe Reaſons we ſhall be brief: yet as *W. P.* ſaid in 1671. ſo ſay we now, that we cannot believe it other then a Sin-pleaſing Notion and a Doctrine of Divels (ſince all Men, as the Scriptures tell us, are to be rewarded according to their deeds) to aſſert, That Wicked and Ungodly Men (while they continue ſo) are in a ſtate of Acceptance

tance and Juſtification with God by the righteouſneſs which Chriſt hath fulfilled in his own perſon, *wholly without them*, which wholy excludes the Work of Sanctification wrought by the Spirit of Chriſt, which was the Notion *W. P.* did briefly, and *Geo. Whitehead* more largely, diſpute againſt in that ſerious *Apology*, ſee (*p.* the 37 to 40) and (*p.* 148) and agreeable to the Quakers ſenſe and belief in this point are theſe following Scriptures *Mat.* 7. 21, 22, 23. & ſo 1 *John* 3. 8, 10. *Rom.* 6. 16. 2 *Cor.* 5. 10. *James* 1. 15. [redacted] In ſhort, altho' we firmly believe, and which *W. P.* and *G. W.* hath aſſerted, that only Jeſus Chriſt is our Juſtifier, yet we do not believe any are truly juſtified in the ſight of God, but ſuch who yield obedience to the Spirit of Chriſt in themſelves, by which they come to do the will of God, and thereby come to obtain the benefit of what Chriſt fulfilled in his own perſon *without us*; in concurrance whereunto we have theſe Scriptures, 1 *Cor.* 6. 11. *Titus* 3. 5. *Rom.* 8. 1, 2, 11, 13, 14. *Heb.* 5. 9. and 12. 14. *Gal.* 6. 7. 8. Now to draw toward a concluſion upon this head; Having proved from that ſerious *Apology* in 1671. That *W. P.* did aſcribe our Juſtification only to Chriſt, and our *Reconciliation with God to faith in his blood*; But grants the benefit of

it only to ſuch, who obey the Spirit of God in themſelves: Let us now ſee whether he be not of the ſame mind and hath aſſerted the ſame Doctrine in 1698. which the Bp. commends as Orthodox; Thus, *Goſpel Truth.* IV. 'That as we are only juſtified 'from the guilt of Sin, by Chriſt the Propi-'tiation, and not by works of Righteouſneſs 'that we have done, ſo there is an abſolute 'neceſſity, that we receive and obey, to 'unfeigned repentance and amendment of 'Life, the holy Light and Spirit of Jeſus 'Chriſt, in order to obtain that Remiſſion 'and Juſtification from Sin; ſince no Man 'can be juſtified by Chriſt, who walks not 'after the Spirit, but after the fleſh, for whom 'he ſanctifies, them he alſo juſtifies; and if 'we walk in the Light as he is Light, his 'precious Blood cleanſeth us from all Sin, 'as well from the pollution, as guilt of Sin, *Rom.* 3. 22. to 26. *Chap.* 8. 1, 2, 3, 4. 1 *John* 1. 7. We will not ſpend farther time to comment upon the matter, to ſhew how agreeable *W. P's.* Belief was in 1671. to what it was in 1698. being ſo very plain that it would be but time loſt ſo to do, and therefore we leave it with the Impartial Reader. Again, the Bp,

But ſays W. P. *if the Bp. commends their believing in Chriſt as a propitiation for Sin, he ought not to have cenſured them as ſhort in*

any

any fundamental Article of Chriſtian Religion ; for that all the reſt follow from, or are comprehended in this ; (p. 25. 26.) truly, *ſays the Bp. he ought.*

Anſw. Here again we muſt charge the Bp. with unfairneſs in laying down words directly as *W. P's.* in a Different Character, (the better to make them appear to be his) and ſoiſting in ſeveral that are none of his ; the Bp. Cites, *p.* 25. 26. *Firſt* Impreſſion, for theſe words, and therefore we will lay down *W. P's.* words in theſe two pages from whence the Bp. pretends to take them, and then let the Reader judg in the matter, Thus *W. P.* (*p.* 28.) the 2*d.* Impreſſion, 'Who ever believes in Chriſt as a Propitia-'tion in order to remiſſion of Sins and juſti-'fication of Sinners from the guilt of Sin, 'can hardly disbelieve any fundamental 'Article of the Chriſtian Religion. Then goes on to prove that ſuch a Believer muſt neceſſarily believe in God, becauſe it is with him alone Man is to be juſtified in Chriſt, becauſe that is the very Propoſition ; and in the holy Ghoſt, becauſe he is the Author of his Conviction, Repentance, and Belief &c. See that page, again. *p.* 28. Adds thus, 'So that acknowledging the ne-'ceſſity of Chriſt as a Propitiation, in order 'to the remiſſion of Sin, comprehends the 'main Doctrine of Chriſtian Religion, and

'as ſo many lines drawn from the Circum-
'ference to the Center, they all meet and
'center in Chriſt, and indeed it is as the
'Navel of Chriſtianity and Characteriſtick
'of that Religion. I would intreat him
'(*meaning the Bp.*) again to reflect well
'upon his own acknowledgment and com-
'mendation of our Belief concerning the
'end and benefit of Chriſt to mankind, and
'he cannot think us ſo deficient, much leſs
'under ſuch ſtrong and dangerous deluſions
'as he has been pleaſed to repreſent us. Thus *W. P.* in theſe tvvo pages vvhich vve vvould have our Reader to compare vvith vvhat the Bp. has laid dovvn as his: And (*1ſt.*) ſee vvhat juſt ground the Bp. could have had to raiſe ſuch contradiction had he taken *W. P's.* ovvn vvords. (*2ly.*) Whether the Bp. did vvell in Quoting theſe vvords directly as *W. P's.* vvithout giving notice he drevv them conſequentially, vvhich in juſtice he ought to have done; But to be ſure very unfair in him to add ſeveral vvords never ſpoke by *W. P.* for beſides packing the vvhole together (vvithout any break) as *W. P's.* vvhich are none of his as they lye, he has added theſe [for all the reſt follovv from] But vve novv come to his Arguments deduced from the premiſes he has made for *W. P.* Says the Bp. (meaning himſelf) *He does not find the Quakers to be*

ſo

ſo good at believing or drawing due conſequences, or deducing and diſcovering all the particulars comprehended in generalls. To vvhich vve anſvver in ſhort that vve do not vvonder he ſhould tell us ſo, vvho ſo ſtrenuouſly endeavours to miſrepreſent us, not only in what's paſt, but in much that follows.

(2) (Says the Bp.) *It is not true that all the fundamentals of Chriſtian Religion follow from, or are comprehended in this Doctrine, Chriſt is our Propitiation, ſome of them (particularly mentioned by Mr.* P. *) do not thence follow, as that there is a holy Ghoſt, that he convinceth Men of Sin,* &c. *Nay not that* (p. 34.) *That Chriſt is aſcended, for he might have been a Propitiation and Sacrifice (as were thoſe under the Law) and yet never have aſcended no nor roſe again.* Mind Reader the words [all] and [*follow from*] nor the deduced words [*does not thence follow*] were not ſpoke by *W. P.* But leaving that with thee we will now attend to juſtifie *W. P's.* words: Then ſay we by the ſame rule, *That no Man can ſay Jeſus is the Lord but by the holy Ghoſt*, as ſaith the Scriptures, 1 *Cor.* 12. 3. Nor no Man underſtand or ſavingly believe or *know the things of God but by the Spirit of God*, according to 1 *Cor.* 2. 10, 11, 12. (tho' we confeſs they may and do pretend to both

traditionally) ſo likewiſe no Man can truly and ſavingly believe Chriſt as a *Propitiation* in order to the remiſſion of Sin, but by the ſame Spirit, and as ſuch, a true Believer hath the holy Ghoſt for the authour of his ſaving conviction and belief; ſo conſequently he muſt believe there is a holy Ghoſt, as *W. P.* well obſerveth, and which convinceth for Sin, according to *John* 16 18. But that we may not be miſunderſtood, we do not here mean of ſuch extraordinary Revelations, as of the knowledg of the outward Hiſtory of *Chriſt's* death and ſufferings, but as of the illumination of the holy Ghoſt in ſuch agreeing with the holy Scriptures. But as to ſuch, from whom God hath with-held the knowledge of the Scriptures, or outward Hiſtory, we ſhall ſpeak of that in its place; in the mean time we ſay he that believes as aforeſaid, to give *W. P's.* own words, ‘ Can hardly disbelieve any fundamental Article of Chriſtian Religion, and ‘ comprehends the main Doctrine of Chriſtian Religion, and as ſo many lines drawn ‘ from the Circumference to the Center, they ‘ all Center in Chriſt.

Then as to the Bp's. ſaying, *Chriſt might have been a Propitiation and Sacrifice (as were thoſe under the Law) and yet never have aſcended, no nor roſe again.* To ſay nothing of the diſproportion between the ſacri-

fices

fices under the Law, and the one Sacrifice of Christ for the remission of Sins, we ask how came the Bp. so greatly to forget himself, thus to assert both in contradiction to the holy Scriptures, as well as his friend *Geo Keith*, (whom he quotes as a close evidence against us) for to the owning of and belief in *Christ* as a *Propitiation* for the remission of Sins (as *W. P.* hath done)? It was no less necessary to that end, that *Christ* should rise again, as that he should suffer: See *Rom.* 4. 25. (besides other Scriptures which for brevity we omit) Where speaking of *Christ*, *who was delivered for our Offences and raised again for our Justification*, here the Apostle makes Christs suffering *and rising again* necessary to his being a *Propitiation*, contrary to the Bp. Next, *G. Keith* in page. 26. of his first Narrative, says expressly thus, *I say with them and all Christendom that if Christ had died and not risen again he could not have been an attonement for our Sins*; this is so full and contrary to the Bp's. Assertion, that we think 'twill both puzzle the Bp. and his Advocate *G. K.* to reconcile the contradiction. But it may be hoped the Bp. will retract, rather then have *G. K* and (if he can believe *G. K.* as readily against himself as he doth against us) all Christendom against him.

Now

Now to his third head, (ſaith the Bp.) thus, *To tell Mr.* P. *thus much as to his Paper once for all, Implication of Faith is not a profeſſion of Faith.*

Anſw. We allow 'tis not ſo in all caſes as we ſhall find it in the Bp. hereafter, particularly in pages 19, 20. of his *Reply*, and ſuch ſtrange ſort of Implications too as that we think no ſuch conſequence can poſſibly be deduced from his premiſes, as he makes; but in our caſe it is otherwiſe, and had he been an Impartial Reader, as he pretended, and had had but a grain of Charity in him towards us, it would have ſaved all this work, while that Paper called *Goſpel Truths* vvas but a brief account (as it tells us) and the Bp. had *R. Barcla's Apology* vvhich ſtates and vindicates moſt of our Principles largely, as alſo *W. P's. Riſe and Progreſs of the Quakers* doth ſeveral of them briefly, vvhich, vve ſhould think, vvould have ſatiſfied moſt or all of his Objections if he vvere not reſolved rather to repreſent us vvrong than right, vvhich vve muſt needs ſay doth but too much appear in his management tovvards us. But farther, as to Implication of Faith: ſince the Bp. can produce no Confeſſion of Faith extant ſo compleat and full, that nothing is left to be made out by Implication he might have ſhevved ſo much candour, as to have given an equal allovvance

(at

(at leaſt) to this ſhort Declaration (vvhich vvas not vvrit as *W. P.* told him in the Preface to his Defence for an exact and compleat account of our Belief) as he vvould to any of thoſe Creeds or Symbols of Faith, which himſelf or the Church he is of embraceth; which had he done, he could not have charged our Confeſſion touching the Beeing of God with imperfection, becauſe there is not in it a word of God's creating the preſent World, or ſupporting it by his Providence, or concerning Himſelf about the inanimate part thereof, with a multitude (he ſaith) of other particulars; for in which we pray of all the Creeds, which the Bp. holds Authentick, is this multitude of particulars expreſt, in the firſt Article touching the Beeing of God without implication? If we look into that which bears the name of the Apoſtles Creed the firſt Article is delivered thus. *I believe in God the Father Almighty, maker of Heaven and Earth*; what one word is here of ſupporting the preſent world by his providence, of concerning himſelf about the inanimate part of it, or of the Bp's. multitude of other particulars? Are not all thoſe to be made out by implication, in this the moſt celebrated, and beſt Creed extent? Again, Is there one word in that Creed concerning the Interceſſion or Mediation of Chriſt for his People?

People? It is ſaid indeed, *he aſcended into Heaven, and ſitteth on the right hand of God the Father Almighty, and that from thence he ſhall come to judg the Quick and the Dead*: But that, ſitting at the Right Hand of his Father, he makes Interceſſion for his People (tho' it be certainly true *Rom.* 8. 34. *Heb.* 7. 25.) is not expreſt in that Creed but left to be ſupplied by implication. Yet again, the Attributes due to God, even thoſe which the Bp. ſays Chriſtianity teacheth of him, where are they in words expreſt in that Creed? Is there a word there, of his Omniſcience, his Omnipreſence, his infinite Goodneſs and Love to Mankinde, his Juſtice, Mercy, *&c.* Will the Bp. allow theſe to be made out by implication, or would he have them left out and disbelieved altogether? By theſe Inſtances the Bp. we hope, will ſee how much his deſire of a blow at *W. P.* and the Quakers made him miſtake, when he ſaid (*p.* 4, 5.) *What an eaſie prevention of all this Imperfection and uncertainty had it been for* W. P. *and his party to have ſaid*, I believe in God the Father Almighty maker of Heaven and Earth; ſince that, without the help of Implication, falls very much ſhort of delivering what he ſays Chriſtianity teacheth of God; To which he adds, *but this had been confeſſing an Article of Faith in a way beneath their Light*, we ſay

no

no more but that, this is a Scoff beneath the gravity which the Bp. pretends to, and was expected from him: But we muſt take leave to tell him, that by his rejecting that Paper called *Goſpel Truths*, and unchriſtianing us for our ſhortneſs in not expreſſing in that Paper all that Chriſtianity teacheth, and that is to be believed concerning God, Chriſt, the Holy Ghoſt, and other Articles of Chriſtian Religion, he has given a deep wound to the common Creed (called the Apoſtles) and to all the Creeds in the Chriſtian World, and ſtruck a very bold ſtroke towards unchriſtianing all Chriſtendom.

But in this we think the Bp. the more to be blamed, in as much as when he writ this, he declares he had before him a Book of *W. P's.* Entitled, *The ſecond part of the ſerious Apology for the principles and practices of the People called Quakers*, Printed in the Year 1671. in which he might, (and could ſcarce but) ſee a more full Confeſſion of Faith, concerning the Eſſentials of Religion, God, Chriſt, and Holy Spirit: We ſay he could hardly miſs ſeeing this, for he took (and that moſt falſely, as we have ſhewed before,) a quotation out of that Book (in *p.* 148.) and this Confeſſion which we now mention is in page, 149. and the pages lye open together, ſo that both are a-

like

alike expoſed to the eye at the ſame time. This Confeſſion is in theſe words, 'We do 'believe in one only Holy God Almighty, 'who is an eternal Spirit, the Creator of all 'things; We would gladly know whether this be not as full, as expreſs, as comprehenſive, as the firſt Article in that which is called the Apoſtles Creed, which ſays only, *I believe in God the Father Almighty maker of Heaven and Earth.* It follows in that Book of *W. P's.* 'And in one Lord Jeſus Chriſt 'his only Son and expreſs Image of his ſub-'ſtance, who took upon him fleſh, and was 'in the World, and in Life, Doctrine, Mi-'racles, Death, *Reſurrection*, *Aſcention* and '*Mediation*; perfectly did and does conti-'nue to do the will of God; to whoſe Holy 'Life, Power, Mediation and Blood we 'only aſcribe our Sanctification, Juſtificati-'on, Redemption and perfect Salvation: Here is a full Confeſſion both to the Divinity and Manhood of Chriſt, his Birth, Life, Doctrine, Miracles, Death, Reſurrection, Aſcention, and (which the common Creed mentions not) his Mediation. Then for the Holy Spirit; whereas the Creed has only, *I believe in the Holy Ghoſt*, *W. P's.* Confeſſion is more full in theſe words, 'And we 'believe in one Holy Spirit, that proceeds 'and breaths from the Father and the Son 'as the life and virtue of both the Father

and

'and the Son, a meaſure of which is given
'to all to profit with, and he that has one
'has all, for theſe three are one, who is the
'Alpha, and Omega, the firſt, and laſt God
'over all, bleſſed for ever, *Amen.* This we ſuppoſe the Bp. will acknowledge to be a more full and plain Confeſſion then that which is in the Common Creed. (called the Apoſtles) with reſpect to the proceeding of the Holy Spirit, from the Father and the Son, not touched in that, beſides what is ſaid in this, concerning the great miſtery of the God-head, [one in three and three in one] commonly expreſt by the word (*Trinity*) of which that Creed (called the Apoſtles) is wholly ſilent. Now ſince the Bp. acknowledges he had that Book of *W. P's.* then before him, out of which we have recited this Confeſſion, which in many material parts is ſo much fuller and larger, then that the Bp. directs to, how unfair and how diſingenious; how uncharitable is the Bp. towards *W. P.* and us, to cenſure and unchriſtian us for a pretended ſhortneſs in the wording of ſome of our Principles; and that too after *W. P.* had told him in the Preface to his *Defence*, that that Paper, which he gave the Bp. was not writ for an exact and compleat account of our Belief; and in the *Defence.* page. 25. to 28. had declared, that to believe in God is to be-

lieve

lieve him, Omnipotent, Omniſcient, and Omnipreſent; and that in believing in Chriſt as a propitiation in order to remiſſion of Sins and juſtification of Sinners from the guilt of Sin, was included not only believing in God, Chriſt, and the Holy Spirit, but a belief of Heaven, Hell, Rewards and Puniſhments, and conſequently the Reſurrection of the Juſt and Unjuſt; this one would think had been enough to have ſatisfied the Bp. or any one elſe, that had not a mind to miſrepreſent or cavil, which it may be feared the Bp. has.

As to what the Bp. ſaith (*p.* 4) *A great Man has told us of the Gentile world and their belief in multiplicity of Gods*, &c. It nothing concerns us, we are not accountable for their, but our own, belief, and had *W. P.* been to preſent ſome heathen Pontiff with our Confeſſion of Faith concerning God and his Attributes, no doubt he would have been more explicit and large, then what is contained, not only in the Paper called *Goſpel Truths*, but even in that Creed called the Apoſtles: But while he intended that Paper for profeſſed Chriſtians, he thought what was delivered therein concerning God, ſufficient to ſatisfie any who had not a mind to cavil. But ſo earneſt is the Bp. in purſuit of *W. P.* and the Quakers, that in ſeeking occaſion againſt them, he plainly miſtakes

miſtakes the Scriptures, which we now come to ſhew. Thus the Bp. (*p.* 4.) *Mr. P. ſaith that* Heb. 11. 6. *ſeems expreſt for a declaration of faith in God. The Bp. takes the freedom to inform him, that it was not at all intended for a full confeſſion of Chriſtian Faith, as to that Article thereof, touching the Beeing, Nature, and Works of God, but only of ſuch an initial or natural Faith which Men had or might have without Revelation; for of the Faith of ſuch, viz.* Abell *and* Enoch, *and thoſe who lived before the Flood without any Revelation that we read of, he there diſcourſes.* Thus the Bp.

Anſw. We anſwer for *W. P.* that he neither wants nor deſires the Bp's. Information, unleſs it were more agreeable to Scripture, then we ſhall find this.———The Bp's. words here doth conſiſt of two parts, the one, *that the Faith of* Abell, Enoch, *and thoſe who lived before the Flood was initial and natural, without any revelation that we read of*: Next that *Heb.* 11. 6. *was a diſcourſe of ſuch a natural Faith*; now if we prove the firſt was divine Faith and the laſt was no diſcourſe of natural Faith, it naturally follows the Bp. hath miſrepreſented the Scriptures; to which purpoſe we will begin with the firſt verſe in the Chapter. *Heb.* 11. 1. *Now faith is the ſubſtance of things hoped for, the evidence of things not ſeen.* And

 that

that this Faith was not natural but divine Faith according to *Eph.* 2. 8. appears very plainly from the context, by the effects it produced; *Verſ.* 2. *By it the Elders obtained a good report.* Verſ. 3. *Through Faith we underſtand the worlds were made by the word of God.* Verſ. 4. *By Faith* Abell *offered unto God a more acceptable Sacrifice then* Cain, *by which he obtained witneſs that he was righteous.* Verſ. 5. *By Faith* Enoch *was tranſlated, that he ſhould not ſee Death, for before his tranſlation he had this Teſtimony that he pleaſed God.* Now to the 6. Verſ. *Which the Bp. ſays was a diſcourſe of natural and initial Faith.* Verſ. 6. *But without Faith it is impoſſible to pleaſe him; for he that cometh to God, muſt believe that he is, and that he is a rewarder of them that diligently ſeek him,* (mind, Reader, the laſt part of this Verſe was a part of what was laid down in *Goſpel Truths* for our belief in God) Verſ. 7. *By Faith* Noah *being warned of God of things not ſeen, as yet moved with fear, prepared an Ark to the ſaving of his houſe, by which he condemned the World, and became heir of righteouſneſs by Faith.* So the Apoſtle proceeds to the end of that Chapter (which is long) ſhewing the great and extraordinary effects of this divine Faith. The Bp. ſeems to reſtrain the Text, *Heb.* 11. 6. *Only to the Faith of thoſe, who lived before the Flood:* But the Apoſtle paſſes

passes on from *Abel*, *Enoch*, *Noah*, to *Abraham* and the rest of the Patriarchs who lived between the Flood and the Law; nor does the Apostle put any difference between the Faith of those before the Flood, between the Flood and the Law, or under the Law, which the Bp. may do well to consider: as also that *Jude* says expressly *Enoch* prophesied, see *Vers.* 14. Will he say he prophesied without Revelation? But to shorten upon the first head; Those Scriptures already cited do so plainly prove our point, that we need not trouble the Reader with any more to shew that it was not natural but supernatural Faith (those holy Men were endued withall) by which (in particular) Enoch *prophesied and was translated*, and Noah *was warned to build the Ark*, which besides the rest are two such plain and extraordinary instances of supernatural Faith by Revelation from God, that we cannot but admire the Bp. should assert those who lived before the Flood had no Revelation that we read of, but what was natural and initial: We leave it with the Reader and proceed to the second part, in which the Bp. asserted that *Heb.* 11. 6. *Was not at all intended for a full confession of Christian Faith, touching the Beeing, Nature, and Works of God, but of natural and initial Faith.*

To which we anſwer (as hath been already ſhewn) they had divine Faith and Revelation before the Flood; ſo conſequently the Bp's. Arguments do fall in courſe: However the Text it ſelf, with the context very plainly intends ſpiritual and divine Faith, not only with reſpect to thoſe extraordinary effects produced by true Faith, as well before as after the Flood, but alſo ſeems expreſſed, (as *W. P.* hath aſſerted) for Faith in God, (And) we ſay (Chriſtian Faith too, becauſe the Apoſtle ſpeaks in the preſent tenſe) notwithſtanding his Attributes be not there enumerated, no more then they were by *Moſes* in the word [*I am*] Inſtanced by *W. P.* but paſt over in ſilence by the Bp. Now to that *Verſ.* 6. We take leave to ask the Bp. what Faith it was *they were to come unto God by*, and without which it was impoſſible to pleaſe him, whether was it Natural and initial, or Spiritual and ſupernatural Faith; if he anſwers (as he ſaid before) Natural, we tell him that cannot be, ſince the Scripture tells us, *all were by nature Children of wrath*, and that Man naturally has nothing, nor can perform any thing acceptable to God; ſee theſe Texts *John* 15. 5. *Eph.* 2. 3. *Pro.* 20. 24. 1 *Cor.* 2. 14. Beſides many other Scriptures; conſequently then, that Faith mentioned *Heb.* 11. 6. intended no other then divine and ſuperna-

ſupernatural Faith as doth moſt plainly appear, not only from the Text, but alſo from the context, as we have ſhewn. Thus, Reader, ſee how the Bp. has miſtaken plain Scripture, no wonder then if he miſtake us, *&c.*——The Bp. proceeds,

P. 5. Again ſaith the Bp. *The acknowledging of future rewards and puniſhments, no more infers the reſurrection from the Dead or eternity of Torments to the Damned, then any of the former points imply what* W. P. *would have comprehended in them.*

Anſw. If they imply but as much we ſhall eaſily clear our ſelves from the Bp's. ſuggeſtions of Heatheniſm or Sociniaſm, for we think the other points are plainly comprehended, as we have above ſhewn; ſo by this rule there needs no farther return to that, to an unbyaſſed Reader.——However we will attend the Bp's. Arguments who proceeds to tell us of *one Syneſius a Chriſtian Phyloſopher* (to ſay no more) *who profeſt he could not believe the reſurrection of the Body*; *and of* Origen, *and the merciful Doctors, who believed future rewards and puniſhments, yet believed not eternal torments, it had been neceſſary therefore ſaith the Bp. for him* (, i. e. W. P.) *and his Brethren explicitly to have declared their belief of theſe main Articles, the Reſurrection and eternal Torments even among the Truths, chiefly be-*

lieved by them, that we might have known the Quakers to be neither Heathens nor Socinians in theſe points, which herein it is plain they may be notwithſtanding their belief that God is a rewarder of them who ſeek him.

Anſw. Syneſius was not only a Chriſtian Phyloſopher but a Biſhop too which we ſuppoſe the Bp. was willing to hide with his Parentheſis, (*to ſay no more,*) the ſtory we have in *Evagrius* Eccleſiaſtick Hiſtory *Lib.* 1. *C.* 15. The old Edition, tells us he could not believe the reſurrection of the fleſh, how ſtated to him we have no account, but if in ſo groſs a manner as ſome have done it in our days we cannot wonder he did not receive it; However tho' he did not receive the vulgar opinion, (for ſo we have it in *Valleſius* his notes in the new Edition) Yet we find the Chriſtians in thoſe times (*viz.* about the Year, 412.) perſwaded him not only to be Baptized but to take upon him the Office of a Biſhop, and he did ſo; whence we obſerve that the vulgar opinion, or the Doctrine of the reſurrection of the Fleſh was not then held ſo Eſſential to the Chriſtian Religion but that a Man might be both a Chriſtian and a Bp. too, tho' he neither did nor would believe it. But to proceed, what ever opinion in reallity he held, or others did or do believe, is nothing to us, we are not accountable for

their

their Faith but our own. (1*ſt.* then) then. As to the Reſurrection from the Dead, we have always believed and owned it by word and writing according to holy Scripture, and which was again fully owned by *W. P.* in his *Defence. p.* 47. 48. Where he alſo ſhews, 'twas ſufficiently implyed in *Goſpel Truths* by future rewards and puniſhments: And ſo ſay we too, otherwiſe we muſt disbelieve the immortality of the Soul, and, believe that it dies with the body which we firmly deny. (2*ly.*) As to eternity of Torments to the Damned we have (likewiſe) alſo ſtedfaſtly believed it, and *W. P.* in his *Defence. p.* 43, 44. hath ſhewn it is fully implyed in *Goſpel Truths*, which we will not farther enlarge upon here becauſe we will cut ſhort and tell the Bp. tho' we will not downright charge him with Inſincerity (what ever it deſerves) yet we think we may ſafely with great partiality (to charge us with ſhortneſs in this point) while he had in his poſſeſſion (before his *Teſtimony* or *Reply* was writ) a Book called the *Riſe and progreſs of the Quakers*, which in (page the. 38.) hath theſe words.—— 'This 'leads us to the acknowledgment of Eternal 'Rewards and Puniſhments, for elſe of all 'People certainly they (*i. e.* the Quakers) 'muſt be moſt miſerable, who for about 'forty years have been exceeding great ſuf-

'ferers for their profeſſion, &c. Now for the Bp. after this to make this objection againſt us, looks indeed very ſtrange, and to be ſure like one that was willing, as *W. P.* ſays, to repreſent us wrong rather then we ſhould be in the right.——But farther, as to Eternal Torments tho' what is ſaid before is ſufficient; yet we cannot but obſerve how unreaſonable the Bp. is to Quarrel with us, for not expreſſing that as an Article of Faith, which is not expreſſed in his own Creed (if that called the Apoſtles be his); for what word in the Creed is there of Eternal Torments, 'tis indeed ſaid therein, *I believe the Life everlaſting*, but not a word of Puniſhments being everlaſting: If the Bp. ſay, that the reward of Life to the Righteous, being everlaſting, implies the puniſhment of the Damned ſhall be everlaſting, may we not then with a great deal of reaſon return his own words, (. *p.*3.) and tell him, Thus much as to that point once for all, Implication of Faith is not a profeſſion of Faith, at leaſt ought not to be claimed by him, that will not allovv it to others. Again, How hath the Bp. caught himſelf in his own Trap; for while his own Creed is ſilent in ſo main a point as Eternal Puniſhments (as he tells us that is) which way will the Bp. Extricate himſelf and his brethren (to give him his

own

own phraſe) from being ſuſpected to be either Heathens or Socinians in that point: If he ſay that this which he calls a main Article is explicitly declared in ſome other Creeds or Declarations of Faith, the Anſwer is, So are they alſo in other Books and writings of ours; and if the Bp. would have given to others the ſame meaſure he takes himſelf, he might have forborn this unneceſſary wrangle.

The end of (*p.* 5. and moſt of *p.* 6.) is about the Trinity, in which point, we find the Bp. ſtill reſolves to have us ſhort, and imperfect, tho' it be by telling of us again much of it word for word, as he did in his *Teſtimony*, Thus 1 *John* 5. 7. *Is not* (ſaith he) *the ſumm of what the holy Scriptures teacheth, nor a ſufficient confeſſion of Faith, of the holy Trinity.* Then adds, *He* [meaning *W. P.*] *inſinnuates* (*which is utterly falſe*) *that the Bp. ſlights that, as a by paſſage or of little credit*, upon which the Bp. appeals to his own *Paper*; then tells us of the *Nicene Creed*, and *Thirty Nine Articles*; then to *W. P's.* demand from the Bp. of the occaſion of the Apoſtles ſpeaking as he did, 1 *John* 5. 7. the Bp. returns thus; *The Bp. anſwers out of* Verſ. 1. 5. *It was to prove that Jeſus Chriſt is the Son of God*, and after ſome more to the ſame purpoſe the Bp. concludes that paragraph, ſaying *p.* 6. *This*

was

was his purpoſe (i. e. *John*) *viz.* to ſettle the Believers Faith in Chriſt) *and not fully there to declare the Doctrine of the Trinity, which is no where done in any one text of Scripture, but is to be gathered out of many.*

Anſw. Is it not ſtrange, Reader, that the Bp. who ſo ſtrangely condemned that Paper (of *Goſpel Truths*) as ſhort and defective for not being more explicit, and full in others as well as in this point, ſhould now a ſecond time, be ſo very defective himſelf, as not to tell us, where thoſe many Texts are, by which the Trinity was to be proved? No, that he has not done, for a good reaſon too, becauſe in all the Scriptures a more full proof could not be found, then 1 *John* 5. 7. But the Bp. to help himſelf, tells us of the *Thirty Nine Articles and Nicene Creed.* To which we anſwer, their foundation in that point ought to be the Holy Scripture; if ſo, why had not the Bp. cited or referred us to thoſe Scriptures, but in ſtead of confirming the *Trinity*, we think he has rather leſſened the proof thereof, while he tells us the Apoſtles purpoſe was to prove that Jeſus Chriſt is the Son of God: for altho' the Apoſtles could not prove the Trinity without proving Jeſus Chriſt to be the Son of God; yet as the Bp. aſſignes that Text. (by the context) chiefly to prove Chriſt was the Son of God, we ask doth he not thereby leſſen

leſſen the proof of the Trinity? vvhile (as we ſaid above) we can no where find ſo full and plain a Text in all the Holy Scriptures to prove the Trinity; we are ſure we deſign not to ſtrain, or miſrepreſent the Bp's. ſenſe, but what we have ſaid, we think, naturally follows from his own words, and far leſs then we could have ſaid on the matter. As to his appeal to his *Paper*, we agree in that point, provided *W. P's. Defence* be compared with it, and there the Impartial Reader will ſee whether *W. P.* hath wronged the Bp's Senſe or not, and whether the Bp. hath not now confirmed *W. P's.* asking, How came *the Bp. to render it a by paſſage*, and the Text it ſelf ſhort, and otherwiſe intended by the Apoſtle, then an Article of Faith *about the Trinity*? ſee. *p.* 33. of *W. P's. Defence* (in two places): and thus we end as to what the Bp. has ſaid about the Trinity.

P. 6, 7. The Bp. tells us we muſt give a more explicit confeſſion of our Faith if we expect to be accounted Chriſtians, for other reaſons then he has given; *eſpecially* (ſays he) *this for one, that a great Perſon among them who profeſſes, as concerning their Principles, he was deceived by them, thinking they had held ſincerely the Principles, which by a more diligent ſearch he finds, they hold not.*

Anſw.

Anſw. George Keith being the perſon he means (as appears in the Margin) we muſt take leave to ſay, the Bp. is greatly miſtaken, for he is neither great among us, nor indeed of us at all, having been denied by us ſome Years paſt; and as to that Man, he muſt either have been a great Hypocrite formerly, or a foul Apoſtate now from us, The former, if for about thirty Years he walkt among us,and defended our Principles by word and writing, and yet at the ſame time was not convinced of the verity of them; an Apoſtate to be ſure if being convinced of our Principles, and from that perſwaſion defended them, while now he retracts, and condemns ſome of the very ſame Principles he then defended.

The Bp. proceeds about *G Keith* (*p.* 7.) *aſſures us* (meaning *G. K.*) and *has Printed Teſtimonies out of their Books to prove they deny.*——

Anſw. As to *G. Keith's* confident aſſurance, we queſtion not that, he having given us ſufficient proof thereof already, by plainly perverting and miſrepreſenting our friends words and writings as well as contradicting, what he has before writ, in defence of us and our principles: and did we only refer back to our friends reitterated (as well as *G. K's.* own former writings) they would ſufficiently prove us Orthodox, as to the four

four following points brought by the Bp. from *G. K's.* Third Narrative; however becauſe the Bp. ſhall not have occaſion to ſay, we paſs them over, we will briefly conſider them: (1*ſt.*) *That they* (i.e. the Quakers) *deny Faith in Chriſt as he outwardly ſuffered at* Jeruſalem, *as he roſe again, aſcended, and now ſits at the right hand of God to be neceſſary to Salvation.*

Anſw. If *G. K.* doth here mean that the *Knowledge* of the outward death and ſuffering of Jeſus Chriſt, is ſo neceſſary to ſalvation, as without the *knowledg* of which all Men are damned and eternally loſt; we anſwer, we dare not be ſo uncharitable as to conclude, that the many millions of Men, who are and have been in the World, and who never had, or heard of the outward hiſtory of the ſufferings and death of Chriſt *&c.* are ſo damned, provided they yield obedience to the Spirit of God in them ſelves, and thereby from unholy become Holy Men.

But if he mean with reſpect to the Quakers, and ſuch who have had the knowledg of the outward hiſtory, as recorded in Holy Scriptures, we hold it abſolutely neceſſary ſo to believe.

(2*ly.*) That *we deny Juſtification by the Blood of Chriſt outwardly ſhed.*

Anſw.

Anſw. To this head we have ſpoken before, and the Bp. himſelf hath allowed *W. P.* Orthodox in what is written in *Goſpel Truth*, ſo we need ſay no more of this now.

(3*ly.*) That we *deny the Reſurrection of the Body that dieth.*

If he mean the ſame *Numerical* Body of *Fleſh*, *Blood* and *Bones*, which we have here on Earth; we know not where he will find Scripture for that; But on the contrary, he may find the Apoſtle, 1 *Cor.* 15. 36. calling ſuch curious *Body* Enquirers, *Fools*. Now as to us we fully own and truly believe the Reſurrection of the Body, according to the Holy Scripture, but are not ſo nice and inquiſitive as to enquire what ſort of Body God will give us, leaving that to his Divine Will, who will give us ſuch a Body as pleaſeth him; and this is Scripture language and agreeable to, 1 *Cor.* 15. 36, 37, 38. and cited by *W. P.* in his *Defence*, againſt the Bp's. *Teſtimony*; in which Book he hath briefly, but fully aſſerted our Belief in this point, which we do not find the Bp: makes any return to in his *Reply*, (by which, as we take it, he tacitly allows him Orthodox therein) notwithſtanding he now brings up this of *G. K.* againſt us.

(4*ly.*) That we *deny Chriſt's coming again without us in his glorified Body to judg the Quick and the Dead.*

Anſw.

Anſw. This charge is falſe, becauſe we own it in expreſs words, and would *G. K.* with the reſt of our Adverſaries, let our plain words and Senſe mean what they ſay, and import, there would be no room left for this malitious charge (as well as many others) for many of our Friends have very often, publickly in print aſſerted our Belief in this point, and *W. P.* in particular, whom I will cite on this occaſion, (beſides in other of his writings) hath fully owned the ſame in *Primitive Chriſtianity revived*; which becauſe we ſhall find his name preſently mentioned in oppoſition to the Articles of the Creed, we will inſert at large as it lies in that Book, *P.* 85. 'Jeſus Chriſt 'took our nature upon him, and was like 'unto us in all things, ſin excepted; that 'he was born of the Virgin *Mary*, and ſuffer-'ed under *Pontius Pilate*, the Roman Go-'vernour, crucified, dead and buried, in 'the Sepulchre of *Joſeph of Arimathea*, roſe 'again the third day, and aſcended into 'Heaven, and ſits on the right hand of God, 'in the power and Majeſty of his Father, 'who will one day judg the World by him, 'Even that bleſſed Man Chriſt Jeſus, ac-'cording to their works.——We think we need not farther enlarge upon this point, then to ſay as we did before, the charge is wholy falſe.

Ibid.

Ibid. (7.) The Bp. proceeds farther about *G. K.* thus; *Nay the ſame perſon* (i. e. *G. K.*) *profeſſes as the Bp. has ſeen under his hand, that he really thinks he can prove* W. P. *holds not one of the Articles of the Chriſtian Creed ſoundly and entirely, and that none ever more plainly oppugned the Doctrine of the Scriptures, then* W. P. *and his party, upon ſo cloſe an evidence as this is; let the World judg, if the Bp. be unreaſonable in demanding a better confeſſion of Faith, then by meer Innuendo's as neceſſary to their being allowed Chriſtians.* Thus the Bp.

Anſw. That the Bp. has ſeen under *G. K's.* hand, we do believe, and it confirms what we heard, *viz.* That he had writ to the Bp. offering to ſupply the Bp. with ſome matters againſt *W. P.* and the Quakers, or at leaſt againſt *W. P.* The uſe we make thereof is only to obſerve how reſtleſs and implacable that Man is, who will ſend over Sea and Land, where he does (tho' but vainly) hope to give a helping hand againſt the Quakers: But as to what *G. K. really thinks he can prove againſt W. P.* we muſt needs ſay, we think him very modeſt to what he uſed to be, in that he has not been more poſitive, in any charge againſt him or the Quakers, then *really thinks,* and it may be a certain indication to all impartiall Men who have been acquainted with his unjuſt

unjuſt perverting and miſrepreſenting way of dealing by our Friends; that 'tis paſt his power by ſuch his foul, way it ſelf to prove *W. P.* denyed any one of the Truths, contained in that Creed called the Apoſtles, much leſs that he did not hold one of them ſoundly and intirely. And as to our *oppugning the Doctrine of the Scriptures*, as he ſays, what ſhall we ſay of ſuch a Man as *G. K's.* thoughts of others, who (as it appears) knew not his own for ſo many Years; If he were to be meaſured by his now writing againſt thoſe things he ſo many Years defended. In ſhort a Malitious Adverſary, and Apoſtate was never a good Evidence againſt the People he deſerted, and ſuch to be ſure is *G. K.* againſt the Quakers. And ſhould we ask the Bp. whether he will grant that a Deſerter from, and an Enemy to, the *Church of England* is a good Evidence againſt that Church, we belive he would hardly allow it; with what reaſon then could the Bp. bring, *G. K's.* Evidence againſt the Quakers: And as to the Scriptures, we aſſert for the Quakers againſt either *his really thinks*, or other his more bold aſſertions, that no people in the World, doth more truly own the Doctrine of the Holy Scriptures then they do: Now as to the Bp's. demanding a better Confeſſion of Faith then by meer *Innuendo's* (by which

we ſuppoſe he means *Goſpel Truths.*) We anſwer him (as we did before) if he had been an impartial Reader as he pretended, and had eſteemed that Paper too ſhort expreſt in ſome points, he would have ſearched *R. B's. Apology*, where he would have found moſt, if not all thoſe Points, (beſides others) largely and fully handled, before he would have ſo expoſed us under a falſe diſguiſe to the World, as he did in his *Teſtimony.*

Ibid. (7.) (The Bp. tells us) *Mr.* Penn *tells the World he and his Brethren receive all the Articles of the Creed (called the Apoſtles,) but this may be reckoned one of the good effects the Bp's. Paper has had to bring them to this acknowledgment.*

Anſw. All things conſidered we think the Bp. has no reaſon to be highly conceited of his *Paper*; for whatever good opinion he has of it himſelf, we believe few, if any, impartial Men has the like; more eſpecialy ſuch, who have read *W. P's. Defence.* If he could have told us and therewith proved *W. P.* and his Brethren had ever disbelieved the Truths contained in that Creed (which *W. P.* ſays we do believe) he might with more reaſon have told the World this, and we tell him, if he had read only ſome of the ſeveral Tracts of *W. P's.* in particular (not to mention many other

other of our Friends) he might have found him owning all the Truths contained in that Creed, called the Apoſtles, and in particular he cannot be ignorant of his owning the moſt eſſential, to wit, Father, Son, and Holy Ghoſt, (we think) as fully expreſt in ſome parts, and more fully in others then in that Creed, even in that ſerious *Apology*. (*p.* 149.) before obſerved, which lay before him, if he had never read any other of his Works.

Ibid. (7.) Now the Bp. begins to forſake the road and inſtead of regularly anſwering page by page, he fetches a large ſtep (in his next charge) from (*p.* 30. to 104.) then backwards, other times forwards, then here, then there, and ſometimes no page at all; for which let us hear the Bp's. reaſon, or rather his pretence he gives us for ſo doing. (*p.* 7.) *It would be* (ſays he) *as endleſs as needleſs, and beſides would ſwell this Paper to too great a Bulk to follow Mr.* P. *page by page to the end, replying to all his little Cavills and poor Evaſions: A more compendious way,* (ſaith the Bp.) *therefore muſt be taken, which ſhall be* (*firſt*) *by reducing Mr.* P's. *Anſwers and Arguments to ſome common Heads or Figures of Speech, which he uſes, ſo contemptible in themſelves, as that the inſtances of them are anſwered by being ſhewn.* And (*2ly*) *by ſing-*

ling out the more material points, wherein Mr. P. *enlarges, and ſetting them in their true light.* Thus the Bp.

Anſw. We confeſs the Bp. hath not only found out a more compendious, but alſo a new way to anſwer his Opponent; for in ſtead of anſwering *W. P's.* Anſwers and Arguments in order, as they lay in his *Defence*, (like a fair Diſputant,) he undertakes to reduce them to ſome common heads or figures of Speech, and ſingle out (as he ſays) the more material points, *&c.* No doubt the Bp. underſtood what he did, for by ſo doing he could the better drop the weight and force of *W. P's.* Arguments and paſs over thoſe points, which pincht him moſt, and what he found too hard for him to anſwer, under the Title of little Cavills and poor Evaſions, contemptible in themſelves; 'tis more then probable the Bp. will come under this Cenſure, and that this unuſual way of dealing with an Opponent, will be accounted (by fair Diſputants) but a poor Evaſion in himſelf, eſpecially if it be remembred, how the Bp. hath already given us an inſtance of the like kind, in paſſing over three or four pages of *W. P's. Defence* (in which *W. P.* enumerated ſeveral inſtances, and charged the Bp. with unfair and abuſive dealing by us) with ſaying only, *to omit things leſs material,*

material; See (. *p.* 9.) Thus, Reader, having given thee this item we desire thy serious perusal of *W. P's. Defence*, with the Bp's. *Reply*, and thy Judgment is free, whether so great a part of that Book, which lyes unanswered by the Bp's. taking such a compendious way, is so poor, little, and contemptible as the Bp. would make it. We now come to consider the several heads or figures of Speech, the Bp. in his way has reduced *W. P's.* Arguments to.

Ibid. (7.) *Manifest Impieties* (saith the Bp.) are, 1st. *His falsifying the Sence of Scripture, and then the words of it so plainly, that he cannot well seem insensible of it himself; thus, Whereas our Lord said*, John 3. 20. *Every one that doth evill hateth the Light, neither cometh to the Light, lest his Deeds should be reproved*: (*which passage to make look favourable to his purpose*) *he corrupts the* 21. Vers. *And reads it thus, He that Loves the Light, brings his deeds to the Light, to see if they are wrought in God: Whereas the plain meaning of the Text is no more, then they that do evill, seek to be hid* (1 Thes. 5. 7. *They that are drunken, are drunken in the Night*) *they who do well fear not to bee seen; to which Sense every Nation hath Proverbs.*——*With us Truth seeks no corners, with many more like.* Thus the Bp.

Anſw. To falſifie the ſence of Scripture knowingly and with deſign, is no doubt great Impiety; but for the Bp. to tax *W.P.* as he hath done in the preſent Caſe, is very Uncharitable, if not Worſe.

Now the Impiety, Falſifying, and Corrupting, (which the Bp. would Unjuſtly faſten upon *W. P.*) conſiſts only in ſaying *Loves the Light*, in ſtead of *doth Truth*: Pray, Reader, turn to *W. P's. Defence* (*p.* 115.) and there thou wilt find *W. P's.* intent was to ſhew, that the Light of Chriſt was to be judg of the deeds of Men, which theſe two Texts do plainly prove from Chriſt's own Words. Now let us ſee what *W. P.* could gain by this alteration, which muſt be his end, if true as the Bp. ſays (*to make look favourable to his purpoſe*) *W. P.* ſays, *Loves the Light*, and the Scriptures, *doth Truth*; Now *Verſ.* 20. ſays, *every one that doth evil hateth the Light, neither cometh to the Light, leſt his deeds ſhould be reproved*: Surely then he that brings his deeds to the Light (as the doer of Truth did) muſt certainly be a lover of the Light; So then he that doth truth *loves the Light*, and he that loves the Light *doth Truth*, where then is the falſifying the ſenſe of Scripture; Nay rather, if there be any difference, (we think) *W. P.* had the diſadvantage, for tho' they do not differ in ſenſe, yet, we think, the words

words [*Doth Truth*] would rather have been more Emphetical in that place then the words [*Loves the Light* ;] Certainly had the Bp. been ſuch a Reader, as he promiſed in his *Teſtimony*, he would not, for this difference, have made *W. P.* guilty of falſifying the ſenſe of Scripture, and to aggravate the matter, adds impiety and corruption ; but on the other hand rather have concluded, that either the Tranſcriber miſt, or *W. P's.* mind ran with the ſenſe, and conſequence of the foregoing *Verſe*, which we believe was the Bp's. own caſe, in his *Reply*, where in (*p.* 17.) he ſays *Matt.* 4. 11. which ſhould be *Matt.* 3. 11. Again (*p.* 22.) he cites, 1 *Cor.* 11. and ſo proceeds upon ſeveral verſes from that Chapter when we believe he intended 1 *Cor.* Chap. 2.

But did the Bp. conſider while he thus vilifyed *W. P.* for the variation of ſome words, which no way altered the ſenſe, that his high charge of Impiety would extend farther and ſtrike higher then he was aware of, or we believe would be willing it ſhould ; for not only *Moſes* in writing the Decalogue in *Deu.* 5. varies from the expreſs terms, wherein 'twas delivered in *Exod.* the 20. but the Apoſtles often, yea and our Lord himſelf in reciting places of

Scriptures out of the old Teſtament vary in our common Tranſlations from the verbal expreſſions of the Scriptures they recite, and give the Senſe in other words. Numerous Inſtances could be given, which for brevity we omit, and will mention but one, and refer to a few more: (thus), *Have ye never read* (ſaith Chriſt in *Matt.* 21. 16.) *Out of the mouth of Babes and ſucklings thou haſt perfected praiſe* ; which words are referred in the Margine to *Pſal.* 8. 2. *Out of the mouth of Babes and Sucklings haſt thou ordained ſtrength.* Then *Matt.* 11. compared with *Mal.* 3. 1. Again, *Matt.* 13. 14, 15. compared with *Iſa.* 6. 9, 10. Again *Rom.* 10. verſ. 11. compared with *Iſa.* 28. 16. Not to ſpend more time we refer the Reader to the Scriptures, where he will find, a multitude of Texts which in our Engliſh Tranſlation vary in expreſs words, but agree in ſenſe. If theſe Inſtances do not convince the Bp. they may a more equal Reader, that in taxing *W. P.* with manifeſt Impiety for giving ſome words of that Text *John* 3. 21. in other words then the Tranſlation has it, while the Senſe was no way altered; he hath therein manifeſted his great uncharitablneſs and diſingenuity. But before we end we muſt tell the Bp. if *W. P.* was guilty of falſifying the ſenſe of Scrip-

Scripture (which we do not allow) he is much more in putting ſuch groſs and carnal meanings upon the words of Jeſus Chriſt, *John* 3. 20, 21. for whereas Chriſt doth there make the Light the judg and tryer of good and bad deeds, in manifeſting the good and reproving the bad, which no other Light can do but the light of his own Spirit; and which appears plainly from the Context, ſee the foregoing 16, 17, 18, 19. *Verſes* Which light lighteth every Man and ſhines in the heart, according to *John* 1. 4. 9. 2 *Cor.* 4. 6. Contrarily the Bp. will have the meaning of theſe two Texts like unto proverbial ſayings and therewith compares, 1 *Theſ.* 5. 7. But what if this Text were allowed a proverbial Speech, what would this do for the Bp. as it would not be a parallel to *John* 3. 20, 21. ſo neither do we think 'twill anſwer the Bp's. turn, while 'tis plain the 5, *Verſ.* compared with *Theſ. Verſ.* 7, makes it a Spiritual Night, and the Bp. oppoſes, *John* 3. 20, 21. to a Spiritual Light, if we underſtand his meaning, by comparing thoſe Texts to proverbial ſayings. But the Bp. has made a great noiſe of *W. P's.* falſifying the ſenſe of the Scripture about thoſe two Texts (when we think 'tis plain, it lies at his own door) and yet at the ſame time paſſeth over ſeveral Scripture Texts advanced by *W. P.* in

that

that ſame place, to prove that this divine Light or Illumination of the holy Spirit is a rule to believing Chriſtians, and that it, with the holy Scriptures, is the double and agreeing Record of true Religion, and particularly cites *John* 14. 15, 16. Chap. *Gal.* 6. 15. 16. 1 *John* 2.20,27. *Rom.* Chap. 8. all which Scriptures the Bp. paſſeth over in ſilence as he doth *W. P.* telling him thoſe words, *John* 3. 20, 21. were ſpoken by Chriſt before the New Teſtament was in being, and therefore a rule and judg of the Life and Deeds of Men. And tho' *W. P.* by way of Interrogation doth thereupon ask, *What ſays the Bp. to this?* Yet no anſwer from the Bp. about their being ſo ſpoken, but at the ſame time taxes *W. P.* with falſifying the ſenſe of *Eph.* 5. 11, 12, 13. a Text not there mentioned by *W. P.* nor doth the Bp, refer us to any other place where we ſhall find it. Thus, Reader, ſee the Bp's continued unfair dealing, and to this we may add another inſtance of like nature out of *W. P's. Defence* (*p.* 52.) where he tells us the Bp. (did to himſelf in *Cork*) read, *John* 1. 9. otherwiſe then it is rendered in our verſions, and that all the Tranſlators, Criticks and Comentators render that verſe about the Light as we do, except the followers of *Socinus*: Yet the Bp. paſſeth it over in Silence.——But no more of

of this now; we proceed to the Bp's. ſecond head of Impiety.

(*P.* 8.) *Says the Bp. his* (*meaning* W. P's.) *reproaching the holy Spirit in the Apoſtles as to what they taught.——Thus when he had no other way to anſwer the Bp's. Arguments for the Divine Authority of Baptiſm by water, taken from* Acts 10. 47, 48. *he ſays plainly, in all which* Peter *ſeems more concerned to ſave his own Credit, then to recommend or eſtabliſh Water Baptiſm.*

Anſw. Reader, (*1ſt.*) We refer thee to *W. P's. Defence*, and there ſee in 17. pages from 75. to 92. whether he hath no other way to anſwer the Bp. about the Divine Authority of Water Baptiſm; and whether on the other hand the Bp. hath not ſaid very little to all the Arguments *W. P.* hath there advanced againſt it. And (*2ly.*) ſee where *W. P.* doth reproach the holy Spirit in the Apoſtles, for we deny it and ſay it is a falſe charge as well as a very uncharitable ſuggeſtion: for by the ſame rule the Bp. may as well ſay, the Apoſtle *Paul* reproached the holy Spirit in *Peter*, becauſe he blamed him thus, Gal. 2. 11. *But when Peter was come to Antioch I withſtood him to the face, becauſe he was to be blamed. Nay in the* 13. *Verſ.* terms it *diſſimulation. Paul* here only blames *Peter* and not the holy Spirit, in a caſe where 'twas plain he was willing

willing to ſave his Credit, we mean his Chriſtian Credit, and Reputation as an *Apoſtle*. And as to *W. P.* he is ſo far from reproaching the holy Spirit, or blaming of *Peter*, that he only ſaith, *Peter* ſeems more concerned to ſave his own Credit, *&c.* then to recommend or eſtabliſh Water Baptiſm. *W. P.* by the words [*own credit*] intended *Peter's Chriſtian* Reputation and Credit as an *Apoſtle* and Miniſter of Chriſt, which he behoved to ſave as much as in him lay, without offending the Jewiſh Zealots on the one hand, or the Converted Gentiles, on the other: And thus we find *Paul* himſelf did, *Acts.* 21. while he underwent legal (but aboliſhed) Purifications by perſwaſion of others; and becauſe the Jewiſh Zealot's might not take offence at him and his Doctrine, and ſo ſlight or reject his Miniſtry. Thus *W. P.* in. (*p.*90.) diſcourſes about *Peter*, ſhewing that the reaſon of *Peter's* ſaying, *Acts* 10. 47, 48. *can any Man forbid water*, was the narrowneſs of his Country mens Spirits, leſt his latitude to the Gentiles might diſtaſt them; But the Bp. according to his uſual way of leaving and taking what he pleaſed in his compendious way, has pict out what he hoped to make ſome advantage of againſt *W. P.* Therefore, kind Reader, be pleaſed to ſee that page at large, where it will very plainly

plainly appear, *W. P.* intended no other, then that *Peter* ſeemed more concerned to ſave his Credit as an Apoſtle and Miniſter of Jeſus Chriſt, then to recommend or eſtabliſh Water Baptiſm (as people do in our days); while 'tis plain from *Peter's* own words afterwards, that he excludes it from having any part in Man's Salvation, by ſaying this, 1 Pet. 3. 21. *The like figure whereunto even Baptiſm doth now alſo ſave us, not the putting away the filth of the fleſh,* [which Elementary Water only doth] *But the anſwer of a good Conſcience towards God,* &c. Now, Reader, judg whether *Peter*, or the holy Spirit in him, doth hereby teach, recommend or eſtabliſh, a divine Authority for Water Baptiſm, as the Bp. ſuggeſts. The Bp. ends this Paragraph thus; *Theſe for a taſte, ſingle inſtances under each head muſt ſuffice*: And ſay we they are a taſte, but 'tis of the Bp's. great unfairneſs to repreſent *W. P.* wrong (rather then of *W P's.* impiety) of which we have had many taſts before, beſides more that follows.

The Bp. goes on, *P.* 8. thus, *Manifold arts of uncharitableneſs and diſingenuity, the Bp. accounts theſe that follow*; (1ſt.) *Calumnious and Spiteful Inſinuations, that he, the Bp. believes not the Thirty nine Arlicles.*

Anſw. A high charge for an imaginary crime, and whether *W. P.* be guilty or not let

let the Reader judg by what follows: *W. P.* in his *Defence* (*p.* 33.) there aſſerts, That no Text in all the Scripture is ſo full and plain to prove the Doctrine of the *Trinity* as 1 *John* 4. 7. which the Bp. had faulted with ſhortneſs; in anſwer to which *W. P.* ſays conditionaly thus. [*I think is a bold attempt if he believes the Thirty Nine Articles.*] This, Reader, is the ground of that high Charge of Spight and Calumny.

Again the Bp's. *Falſe Imputations*; *he downright charges the Bp. with Levity and Scorn, as to the Language, Thee and Thou.*

Anſw. The Bp's. *Teſtimony* as to the point runs thus. *Would it not make a mans ſtomach turn*, &c. We ask what is this leſs then Levity and Scorn thus to treat a People (eſpecially without diſtinction) that are conſcientious in uſing the Scripture language of *Thee* and *Thou* to a ſingle perſon, and for which many of them have been great ſufferers; but as to the uſe of that Language *W. P.* hath defended it by Arguments, which are unanſwered by the Bp. in his *Reply*, tho' he has again made reflections, which in their place we ſhall take notice of.

P. 9. The Bp. ſpends moſtly to vindicate himſelf, and charging *W. P.* with falſe Imputations, *&c.* For *W. P's.* ſaying the Bp. in his *Teſtimony*, judged and cenſured the

the Quakers, which tho' the Bp. ſtill denies, yet that he ſo did, and that *W. P's.* charge was true. Obſerve Reader what follows: Thus in his *Teſtimony*, he tells us, *We are ſhort and defective in that Confeſſion*, viz. (Goſpel Truths) *to denominate us Chriſtians, makes us deluded*, by judging of us *under ſtrong deluſions*; then with relation to our belief of the Light of Chriſt within (ſo often repeated in holy Scripture) he ſaith thus, *For any perſons to yield themſelves to ſuch conduct, (beſides or againſt holy Scripture) is plainly to abandon themſelves to the deluſions of the Devil.* Again ſaith the Bp. *As you will anſwer all your ſecret arts and high pretentions*, &c. Again, *I will not* (ſays the Bp. *here interpoſe making gain your godlineſs.* Theſe with more, as to Spiritual matters in that *Teſtimony*; Now as to Temporals, which he would inſinuate we make Religion a cloak for, (which we affirm as *W. P.* hath ſaid to be the worſt conſtruction, the moſt irreligious could make) *Is it not* (ſaith the Bp.) *your main end and ſtudy by* Pretended Mortifications, and Renouncing *the World, while there are no ſort of Men alive, that more eagerly purſue it, nor have more effectual wily and ſecret ways of getting wealth then your ſelves*, &c. Minde, Reader, our *Mortifications pretended*, and his poſitive aſſertion of us, *There are no ſort of Men*, &c. Theſe with much

much more from the Bp. in that Paper; and after all tells us, He does neither judg nor cenſure us, and charges *W. P.* at a great rate for telling him he does, nay prays for him upon it thus, *God give Mr.* Penn *more charity and reaſon*, &c.——*He does not know, or will not attend, what judging as it means cenſoriouſneſs is*, &c. And at the ſame time as a confirmation of his *Teſtimony* adds a new: Now in his Reply. (*p.* 1.) *Our ſlight, cunning craftineſs, lying in wait to deceive*, &c. And likewiſe (*p.* 9.) we are now upon, charges us again as above with wily and ſecret ways of getting wealth, *&c.* Again (*p.* 21.) thus. *If minding worldly gain, and being ſo intent upon it day and night, as to paſs moſt days in the week without prayer to God, either in publick Aſſemblies or private Families; if the ſlyeſt ways both to get money and to keep it, be worldlyneſs, he knows no ſort of people more given to theſe vices then the Quakers.*

Anſw. Candid Reader, we now refer it to thee in what we have above cited, out of the Bp's. *Teſtimony*, whether the Bp. did judg and cenſure us or not; And while he tells *W. P.* he doth not know, what Judging and Cenſoriouſneſs means, we would fain know, what ſort of Language it is, he would give the Quakers, that he will allow to be Cenſuring of us.——He has charged

us

us in his *Teſtimony* at a great rate about our ſecret and wily ways of getting wealth, and has endeavoured to confirm the ſame now in his *Reply*, as above cited, which we brought together to the end we might not be troubled with anſwering in ſeveral places to one and the ſame Charge: Now to this (to uſe the Bp's. own Phraſe) *Scurrilous*, *Unchriſtian*, and general charge without proof. We anſwer, As it is far from *modeſty*, (which he applys to the title of his *Reply*) ſo it is alſo a contradiction to himſelf in his *Teſtimony* where he told us thus, *I look upon many of you as an honeſt and well meaning people.* Now to be ſure ſuch ſecret and wily ways of getting, &c. as he hath charged upon us in his *Teſtimony*, and now again in his *Reply*, with minding it to ſuch a degree as to neglect prayer to God, &c. is inconſiſtant with harmleſſneſs, well meaning, and honeſty: To be ſhort upon this point; we appeal from the Bp. our partial Judg, to our impartial Neighbours, who know and are better acquainted with our way of dealing then he; And now may we not with much more reaſon, return his charge of worldlineſs upon himſelf, and that not without proof, as he has done by us: what elſe made him leave his old Biſhoprick and Friends of *Cork* for a new one, and ſtrangers in the North of *Ireland*, was it not becauſe

the latter was worth ſome hundreds *per annum* more then the former? and could he have aſſigned ſo plain a proof as this (of our making Gain Godlineſs, as he ſuggeſts of us in his *Teſtimony*) he might with more reaſon, and greater juſtice, have reiterated his charge of worldlineſs upon us as he has done. But to proceed,

Ibid. (P. 9.) Says the Bp. againſt *W. P's. Sly Jeers, I would have my Reader reflect on this, tho' he were as big as a Bp.*

Anſw. Reader, look *W. P's. Defence:* p. 33. ſecond Impreſſion, from whence the Bp. took this; there ſee *W. P.* requeſts any Reader (tho in as great a Quality as a Bp.) to reflect upon that great and Eſſential Truth of *Regeneration*; but with what Candour could the Bp. make this a fault in *W. P*, and at the ſame time be guilty of much greater himſelf, *viz.* plain and open Jeering, ſuch as calling *W. P. King of Penſilvania*, inſinuating him in the number of *great men of Sin*, reproaching and jeering him with a ſpirit of diſcerning in a caſe that related to matter of fact, and proveable as we have before obſerved: But the Bp. adds, *No Bp. in theſe three Kindoms has the big and Scornful look and deportment of Mr. P. eſpecially when he is in the humour of it.*

Anſw. Is this to ſuſpend Cenſure, here is a harſh charge, and as he has not, ſo he will

will never be able to prove it: As, 1*ſt.* we queſtion whether the Bp. was ever in *W. P's.* company above two or three times, and if his prejudice to him made him think he had ſo big and ſcornful a look and deportment, (which thoſe who have converſed frequently with him never ſaw) Yet (2*ly.*) it is very improbable he ever ſaw all the Bp's. in theſe three Kingdoms: But ſuppoſing he did, we are ſure 'tis as impoſſible as unlikely he could be ſure none of them had ſo big a look, &c. as *W. P.* ſince he could not be always with them, and conſequently not know, how big, &c. they looked at abſent times, eſpecially when they were *in the Humour of it.*——But to go on to more Jeers, (as the Bp. terms them of *W. P.*) ſays the Bp. of *W. P.* the *Bp's hell.*——*He keeps the true hell to himſelf* (*God deliver Mr.* P. *from it?*) So ſay we of the Bp. and to be ſure *W. P.* too? But with what reaſon could the Bp. make this a Jeer look, Reader, in *W. P's. Defence? p.* 44. where *W. P.* enumerates after the Bp's. *Teſtimony* what *Goſpel Truths* could mean of Hell, *viz.* whether the *Grave*, a place of Temporal Puniſhment after this life, or a ſtate *of total Deſtruction*, &c.—whereupon *W. P.* argues thus, 'What if we mean 'none of theſe, may we not be in the right 'for all that? for what if none of theſe are

'the antient common and Scripture belief, 'what will the Bp. do then? one would think 'one of them is the Bp's Hell, and either 'one of theſe is an Article of his Belief, or 'elſe he keeps the true hell to himſelf, and 'was not ſo juſt as to include that in the 'queſtion with the reſt, *&c.*

We have been the larger in this quotation to ſhew how ready the Bp. is to take an advantage againſt *W. P.* when he had really none. 'Tis plain *W. P.* meant (*By the Bp's hell,*) that Notion which he received and holds of it; and by the words (*keeps the true Hell to himſelf,*) he with-holds and keeps back his own Notion and Opinion of the True hell, and does not expreſs it among the other Notions he gave of it, ſo keeps it *to himſelf*, not *for himſelf*.—But the Bp. goes on:

P: 10:) *How could the Bp. more clearly have expreſt Hell, then by the eternity of Torments, the Term there uſed by the Bp. and declined by Mr:* P. *and his brethren.*

Anſw. Remember, Reader, the Bp. would not allow *W. P's.* implication of Faith for a profeſſion of Faith, tho' he'll take it himſelf; 'tis true he mentions everlaſting puniſhment of wicked men, but 'tis by way of Objection againſt *Goſpel Truths*, and not laid down by the Bp. as an Article of Faith; But how has *W. P.* and his Brethren declined that term,

term, while they acknowledg Everlaſting Rewards to thoſe who fear God, and that thoſe who feared him not ſhould be turned into *Hell*? which doth imply Eternity of Torments, according to the common acceptation, and received opinion of moſt Chriſtians, as well as our ſelves: But we muſt needs ſay, we could much eaſier paſs by this Objection in another, then in the Bp. becauſe *W. P.* has owned Eternal Rewards and Puniſhments in expreſs words in *the Riſe and Progreſs of the Quakers.* (P. 38.) as we have before obſerved (which Book the Bp. had ſo lately in his pocket:) But we think the reaſon is plain, for want of occaſion he will rather make then want one againſt the Quakers.

Ibid. (P: 10) The Bp. charges *W. P.* with *wilfuly falſe conſtructions of and overlooking the Bp's. Senſe, Tergiverſations, ſhifting, pittiful Evaſions; for inſtance, the Bp. had ſaid they do not in their Paper own the Son of God to be ſo much as Jeſus (the great Saviour who delivereth from the wrath to come) or the Chriſt, &c.* (But ſays the Bp.) *Mr. P. anſwers, they ſeveral times call him Chriſt and admires at the Bp's. palpable miſtake;* (*and goes on*) *does* W. P. *then know no difference between Chriſt, and the Chriſt, betwixt calling a Perſon by his Name, and acknowledging his Authority, Office and Benefits?* Thus the Bp.

Anſw. Suppoſe *W. P.* had only named him Chriſt, the Bp. may know, if he doth not already, that Chriſt is not ſtrictly a proper name, but an apellative; it denotes *the Anointed*, the *Meſſiah*, and applicable to none beſides Chriſt, a name not given him by his kindred or the Jews, read *Mat.* 2. 4. *Chap.* 16. 16. *Mark* 12. 35. *Luke* 4. 41. *Chap.* 24. 26. 46. *Joh.* 4. 25. *Chap.* 7. 26. 27, 31, 41, 42. *Chap.* 9. 22. *Chap.* 12. 34. In theſe with many other places of Scripture, 'twil plainly appear, that it would be incongruous to underſtand the name Chriſt otherwiſe then as an apellative, deciphering his Office and Qualification, *viz.* the *promiſed Meſſiah*; and not a proper name, which Jeſus was, and common to him with others, but none was Chriſt but himſelf, ſo that the very naming the Word Chriſt implies the anointed Saviour and Redeemer, the Meſſiah that was promiſed and came from God. But farther, What can be more unfair and trifling then this of the Bp. thus to charge *W. P.* For firſt *Goſpel Truths*, beſides calling him Chriſt no leſs then Nine times, doth own ſeveral of Chriſts Offices proper only to the Chriſt. (If there were any room, as there is not for the Bp. to ſuggeſt *W. P.* could poſſibly mean any other then the Chriſt of God) and particularly, beſides others, that he is

the

the *Propitiation* for the remiſſion of Sins, and Juſtifyer from the guilt of Sin: and beſides, that Paper hath ſeveral references to Scriptures *concerning the Chriſt*. And now as to *W.P's. Defence*, pray, Reader, ſee from (p. 34. to. 39.) where *W. P.* fully again owns *the Chriſt*, and *Jeſus Chriſt*, the Word made *Fleſh*, the *beloved Son of God*, the only begotten of the Father, &c. And yet for all this the Bp. is ſo unfair, as to continue this Objection, and pick out words from *W. P's. Defence* to ſuit his turn, leaving out what explains them, but thereby his charge upon *W. P.* muſt fall upon himſelf, *viz. pitiful ſhifting Evaſions, with willfully overlooking his Sence*; certainly if this be fair dealing, we are to learn what it means. But to the next,

(*P.* 10.) The Bp. goes on thus, *Again the Bp. requires them to embrace & profeſs the entire Chriſtian Faith in the points wherein he has ſhewn them defective, that is, as he proved in above two thirds of the Creed. W.P.* (ſays the Bp.) *Anſwers it would have become the Bp. to have told them what he would have them believe, could the Bp. have ſpoke plainer then he does when he names the Articles of the Creed, which* Mr P. *ſays he holds, therefore knows.* Thus the Bp.

Anſw. The Bp. who cry'd out againſt ſhortneſs and imperfection ought not to

have been guilty thereof himſelf, for we can find no ſuch words in his *Teſtimony*, as *Creed* or *Articles of the Creed*; but perhaps he'll ſay they are implied (a thing he will not allow in *W. P.*) when he ſays thus in his *Teſtimony*, *There is not One Article of our common Twelve you have owned entirely, and Eight if not more of them you have totally ſuppreſſed or waved.*

If this be not what the Bp. means by the Creed, we cannot find another like it to his purpoſe in all his Paper. But *W. P.* ſays he *holds the Creed, therefore knows it*, does he ſo? and the Bp's. Conſcience, (we think) muſt know *W. P.* and the Quakers owned Articles of Faith more largely worded then in that brief Paper, ſince he had *R. B's. Apology*, and *the Riſe and Progreſs of the Quakers*; And therefore why ſhould the Bp. cenſure, and raiſe objections to ſuch Articles. But now ſuppoſe *W. P.* ſhould gueſs at what the Bp. meant by *the common Twelve*; we ſuppoſe the Bp. will not ſay that *Teſtimony* was calculated only for *W. P.* but the Quakers in general, (as well as others); why then might not *W. P.* with a great deal of reaſon tell the Bp. it became him to be more explicit, ſince no doubt, many thouſands of People beſides the Quakers did not underſtand what the Bp. meant by *the common Twelve*, and therefore the Bp. who

who would almoſt unchriſtian the Quakers, for not being more expreſſive, upon the Articles of the Creed, ought not to have been ſo ſhort himſelf; but according to his Cenſuring the Quakers, inſtead of ſaying *common Twelve*, he ſhould have made the Creed into diſtinct Articles, and laid them down for us. But leaving this we proceed to the next.

(Ibid. 10.) *Inconſequent and trifling inferences*, (ſays the Bp. of *W. P.*) *ſuch are* p. 31. *we call him the beloved Son of God, the only begotten of the Father, therefore conceived of the holy Ghoſt*; *Mr.* P. *knows* Solomon *was named* Jedediah [the Lords beloved.] David *ſaid to be his begotten Son*, Pſal. 2. *his firſt born.* Pſal. 89. 27. *Yet neither conceived of the holy Ghoſt, nor born of a Virgin.* Thus the Bp.

Anſw. Certainly we believe hardly ever came more trifling matter (to ſpeak in his way) from a Man in the ſtation of a Bp. Be pleaſed, Reader, to read *W. Ps. Defence* (from, *p.* 35. to 39.) where he anſwers the Bp. fully upon this point of the manifeſtation of Chriſt Jeſus in the fleſh, and ſhews plainly, that altho' the words [conceived of the Holy Ghoſt and born of the Virgin] be not expreſſed in that brief Paper *Goſpel Truths*, yet they are very fully implied; and take but the above words, which

which the Bp. has pickt out of the *Defence*, and they imply no leſs; for who was the beloved Son of God and only begotten of the Father, according to *John* 1. 14. Chap. 3. 16. but *Jeſus Chriſt* that was *born* of the *Virgin*: But ſays the *Bp.* Solomon *was named* Jedediah *the Lords beloved*, what then, ſo was *Daniel a Man* greatly *beloved of the Lord*, and many other ſervants of God too. But where was any of them called *the Word made Fleſh*, *the only begotten of the Father*, *full of Grace and Truth*, his *beloved Son*, in whom he was *well pleaſed*, who *taſted death for every Man*, his office of *Juſtification*, *a Propitiation*, named *Jeſus Chriſt*, with all this and more of the ſame kind, in *Goſpel Truths*, and again repeated by *W. P.* in his *Defence*. And now for the Bp. a ſecond time to ſuggeſt ſuch trifling things we ſhould tell him it looks like trifling for trifling's ſake, did we not find ſome of it worſe; and indeed it looks as if the Bp. would falſify the ſenſe of Scripture, rather then want proof to make *W. P.* guilty of trifling and inconſequent Inferences; thus he has cited *Pſal.* 2. and *Pſal.* 89. 27. to make the Scripture ſerve his turn againſt *W. P.* whereas 'tis undenyable, what is ſaid in the ſecond *Pſal.* is ſpoken of Chriſt himſelf, which is fully confirmed in the New Teſtament in theſe words, *Acts* 13. 33. *God hath raiſed up Jeſus again*,

as

as it is written in the ſecond Pſalm, *Thou art my Son this day have I begotten thee*: Then as to *Pſal.* 89. 27. is it not very plain *David* doth there perſonate Chriſt; it runs thus, *Alſo I will make him my firſt born higher then the Kings of the Earth.* We will not enlarge on the matter, only add, that if the Bp. could have proved ſuch groſs falſifying the plain ſenſe of Scripture as this, we ſhould (no doubt) have heard of it very loudly, while the Bp. made ſo much adoe about two words which altered not the ſenſe, as we have before ſhewn. But no more of this now.

Ibid. 10. The Bp. quotes *W. P.* for another trifling inſtance.——*He that confeſſeth him made fleſh, confeſſeth him made fleſh by God, and therefore made holy fleſh; does not all the World know* (ſay's the Bp.) *that all fleſh is made by God, and do we hence conclude all fleſh is holy, or conceived by the holy Ghoſt, many more may be inſtanced.*

Anſw. Here's Inſtances enough already and more then are conſiſtant with the Bp's. Credit, (as we have ſhewn) and truly (we think) as little to the purpoſe as moſt Men ever wrote, and indeed, we do begrudg the time we ſpend in anſwering ſuch trifling (if ſome of it be not unjuſt) matter, were it not for the ſake of Truth, and for thoſe who may think there is more

in

in the Bp's. Arguments, then really there is; and had we at firſt only referred the Reader to *W. P's. Defence* for anſwer to all theſe trifling Inſtances, it would have fully anſwered them, and ſo fully too, that we muſt take *W. P's.* own words to anſwer the Bp. again, becauſe the Bp. hath ſo unfairly pickt out ſuch as he hoped to make ſome advantage of; and not only ſo, but in this inſtance hath put in a word of his own, and left out three of *W. P's.* without which he could not have made good his charge againſt *W. P.* And to ſhew that he hath ſo done, we here give *W. P's.* own words, as they lye in his *Defence. p.* 34. Thus. *W. P.* 'He 'that confeſſes the word was made fleſh, 'confeſſes him made fleſh by God, and there-'fore made holy fleſh, which is ſound 'Doctrine, and agrees with *John* 1. 14. *The word was made fleſh and dwelt among us, &c.* Now inſtead of theſe words [the *Word was*] the Bp. has only put in the Word [*him*] Again had not the Bp. ſo unfairly left out three of *W. P's.* words, the diſtinction between Chriſt's fleſh and all other fleſh, was plainly and fully imply'd by ſaying the *Word was made fleſh*; for who was the *word made fleſh*, but Chriſt *the beloved Son of God*, and *only begotten of the Father*, and ſo *W. P.* calld him, but four lines before; ſurely one would think, here

was

was distinction enough, between Christ's flesh, which was conceived by the holy Ghost, and all other sinful flesh, to satisfie any, who had not a mind to Cavil or trifle for triflings sake. Now, Reader, judg in the matter; Did the Bp. deal justly with *W. P.* in thus doing by him, to answer his unfair purposes? but 'tis no news for the Quakers to be thus abused and misrepresented by their Adversaries, as we noted in the begining. And now to the Bp. What is become of his *trifling*, and *inconsequent inferences*? where is *wilfuly false overlooking the plain Sense*? where is *manifold arts of uncharitabelness and disingenuity*? where is the *falsifying and perverting plain sense of Scripture*, and consequently *impiety*, and *corruption*, we leave it with the candid Reader, who they are fallen upon, whether the Bp. or *W. P.* And so we proceed.

Ibid. 10. Saith the Bp. of *W. P. Contemptious and scornful Language such is that reflection a weak head*———Which, Reader, observe *W. P.* alluded to himself, in relation to the Bp's. Arguments, in case his instances were no better to the purpose then the Bp's. upon that expression of the Bp's. *stomach turning*, we will not call the Bp. a weak head, but we are sure, we should think our Arguments weak, were they no more to the purpose, then the Bp's. are, in what's past;

paſt; but in regard the Bp. did not anſwer *W. P's.* Arguments about the Language Thee and Thou to a ſingle perſon, they remain yet in force againſt the Bp. And as to his Reflections on our conſcientious uſing that Language, calling it a *wicked kind of weakneſs, together with an abuſe of Religion, not to be endured*, expreſſions (highly ſavouring of ſcorn and contempt) we paſs by as the effect of too much warmth.

P. 11. The Bp. tells us, that *W. P's.* Cenſures of him ſavours *of nothing but the height of Spiritual pride and uncharitableneſs, as that the Bp. feels no ſhare in Chriſt the glorious light of Men, that he wants acquaintance with the Spirit of God in his Worſhip.*

Anſw. This Reflection of Spiritual pride and uncharitableneſs upon *W. P.* we will paſs by here, and refer the Reader to what follows; to judg whether it will not thence appear true what *W. P.* hath ſaid of him. And (1*ſt.*) we begin with what the Bp. ſays of the Light within, being one of the main points (as he tells us) *that threatens doing hurt in* W. P's. *whole Defence.* And thus the Bp. begins.

Ibid. 11. The *Bp. did ſay, and ſtands to it, he knows not what to make of the Quakers Light within.*

Then ſay we, *W. P's.* opinion of the Bp's. feeling no ſhare therein muſt be true; nor will

will his calling of it the Quakers Light ſerve his turn, ſince the Quakers never called it *their Light*, nor owned any *Other Light* then the *Light of Chriſt* for their guide, and which the Scriptures ſo abundantly teſtifie unto, and *W. P.* hath very plainly and fully ſhewn. But the Bp. goes on,

But as to the True Divine Light or the holy Ghoſt convincing people, by the holy Scripture applied to Conſcience, of Sin, of Righteouſneſs and of Judgment to come, the Bp. acknowledges it and bleſſeth God for his ſhare thereof.

Anſw. As we ſaid before we never meant any other, then the true Divine Light or holy Ghoſt, which we ſay, doth inwardly convince of Sin, reproves for it and by the diſcovery of which we ſavingly come to know the things of God, and is the principal agent and foundation of our conviction, and by which the holy Scriptures are made beneficial unto us: If the Bp. mean thus by the above words we agree, but if he mean (as his words ſeem to us to import) that the Scripture is the firſt Agent, and by which, as the cauſe we are convinced by the Light or Spirit, we muſt diſſent from the Bp. herein, and that the Bp's. meaning is ſuch, we are the more confirmed therein, by what he ſaith in. (*p.* 23.) viz. that *people are now made holy by the uſe of outward means.* That this Doctrine is repugnant to Scripture

Scripture we ſhall plainly ſhew in its place; we only brought it here to compare and explain what the Bp. means by the convictions of the Light and Spirit. Now to the above Argument, the Quakers do ſay, and the Scriptures do abundantly prove, that it is by the holy Light and Spirit of Chriſt within, by which as the firſt principal Cauſe and Agent we come ſavingly to believe, and know the things of God; to which purpoſe we could cite a multitude of Scriptures, but for brevity let theſe few ſuffice; *Rom.* 1. 19. *That which may be known of God is manifeſt in them, God hath ſhewed it unto them.* 2 Cor. 4. 6. *God who commanded light to ſhine out of darkneſs hath ſhined in our hearts to give the light of the knowledge of the Glory of God in the face of Jeſus Chriſt.* John 1. 4. *In him* (viz. Chriſt) *was life and that life was the light of Men.* Verſ. 9. *He* (viz. Chriſt) *was the true Light, which lighteth every Man that cometh into the World.* Again, 1 Cor. 2. 10, 11, 12. *But God hath revealed them,* (viz. the things of God) *unto us by his Spirit, for the Spirit ſearcheth all things, yea the deep things of God, even ſo the things of God knoweth no Man but the Spirit of God. Now we have received not the Spirit of the World, but the Spirit which is of God, that we might know the things that are freely given us of God.* Again, 1 John 2. 27.

But

But the anointing which ye have received of him abideth in you, and ye need not that any Man teach you, but as the ſame anointing teacheth you of all things. Again even to the wicked Phariſees, the worſt of Chriſt's Enemies, he ſaid, *Luke* 17. 21. *Behold the Kingdom of heaven is within you.* Then *Rom.* 8. 2, 11, 14, 16. 1 *Cor.* 3. 16. *Eph.* 4. 6. 1 *John* 5. 10 Theſe Texts (beſides many more we could cite) do ſufficiently prove our point that it is by the Light and Spirit of God inwardly manifeſted, by which as the firſt and principal means we come to have a ſight of Sin and be convinced of it, and while the Bp. ſays 'tis by the uſe of outward means people are made holy as in (*p.* 23.) we are (we think) by the ſame rule to underſtand he means they are to be convinced of Sin, Righteouſneſs and of Judgment; If he thus intends 'tis worthy his conſideration how contrary his Aſſertion is to the Scriptures we have cited, and whether he has that ſhare in the Divine Light and Spirit of Chriſt as he pretends to: But that we may not be miſunderſtood, as if we went about to undervalue the Holy Scriptures; far be it from us, for we do declare for our ſelves, and the People called *Quakers* in general, that we Love, Honour, and Eſteem them above and beyond all the Books and Writings in the whole World;

and are thankful to the Lord for their preſervation, as having found great comfort and benefit by them, thro' the illumination of the holy Spirit, and believe them to be, whatſoever they ſay of themſelves according to theſe or any other Scriptures, *Rom.* 15. 4. 2 *Tim.* 3. 15, 16, 17. We ſhall not be altogether ſo full as to the Scriptures here as we might, in regard we ſhall have farther occaſion hereafter, where we ſhall be more full upon this head; Yet here may be a fit place, to anſwer the Bp's. demand (*p.* 13.) viz. *What is become of Mr.* P's. *Double Record.* We anſwer, here it is, the Light, Grace, and Spirit of God, by its illumination giving us the experimental knowledg of the things of God within (as we have ſhewn) *is one*; agreeing with and opening to us the Miſteries of the *Holy Scriptures* (without) which is the *other*: And thus the Apoſtles made the Scriptures of the Old Teſtament an agreeing Record with the openings and the illuminations of the holy Ghoſt in them, while they cited numerous Texts and portions of Scripture out of the Old Teſtament as an agreeing record, to what they imediatly delivered by the Revelation of the Spirit; this (we think) is ſufficient to make good *W. P's.* aſſertion, that the Light and holy Spirit within, and the Scriptures without, are the Double and agreeing Record of true Religion. (*Ibid*

(*Ibid.* 11.) The Bp. goes on vilifying *W. P.* about the Light within, (to pass by his twitting of him about his Learning) saying thus, *He* (i. e. the Bp. himself) *had made four the most rational constructions and conjectures he could devise of what they* (the Quakers) *should mean thereby* (p. 12.) *Mr.* P. *rejects all with scorn and vile insinuations.*

Answ. Reader, be pleased to see *W. P's.* Defence from *p.* 52. to 65. and whether what the Bp. saith be true or not. And since the Bp. hath not answered *W. P's.* Arguments, but with reproachful words, breaking through and overlooking most of the many Scripture proofs brought by *W. P.* to demonstrate what he and the Quakers meant by the Light and Spirit of Christ within. We say since the Bp. hath so done, both *W. P's.* Arguments and such Scripture proofs lye at his door, together with those we have added as a farther proof and demonstration of what we mean by the Light and Spirit of Christ within, (not here to mention our own experience of the virtue and efficacy thereof with the Blessed Effects which to the Glory and Praise of God, we have found thereby) so that if after all that has been said, the Bp. shall still declare his ignorance of what the Quakers mean, by the Light within, 'tis but too evident a

proof of the little ſhare he has in or acquaintance with it.

(*P.* 12. 13.) The Bp. brings in *R. Barclay* for a ſhare, reproaching him alſo with Banter and Cant about the *Light within*; in reading which we could not without noted obſervation remember how ignorant the Bp. made himſelf in his *Teſtimony* concerning the Quakers Principles, and how ready he was to charge, and almoſt unchriſtian them for the brevity of *Goſpel Truths*, notwithſtanding he had *R. B's. Apology* which fully handled ſome of thoſe very points, he pretended to make a new diſcovery of, and condemned in that Paper, as being ſhort expreſt: Yet now from the ſame Book, he can nicely pick words here and there, ſome of them many pages diſtant and put them together, in expectation (by abuſing *R. B's.* ſenſe and making falſe conſtructions) to ſerve his turn againſt the Quakers.

He tells us *p.* 12. *No rational Man alive can make ſenſe of what he* [R. B.] *has writ thereon* (i. e. Light within.)

Anſw. The Bp. is here a great undertaker whilſt (1*ſt.*) 'tis impoſſible for him to be ſure, all the rational Men alive, who have (or may read) *R. B's. Apology* on that ſubject, are of the ſame mind with him. (2*ly.*) We tell him, another Mans affirmative may be as good as his negative; and not

not to mention the moſt rational Men, there are as rational Men as the Bp. (not to leſſen him) who can make ſenſe of what *R. B.* has writ. But we the leſs wonder the Bp. ſhould not underſtand what *R. B.* and others have ſaid of the Light within, ſince he appears, ſo unexperienced about Spiritual matters, as to Revile *R. B.* with being unintelligible, and guilty of Banter, not only concerning the Light, but about Spiritual ſenſes plainly proveable by Scripture, as we ſhall anon evince; and in the mean time we ſhall conſider the Bp's. next and greateſt charge in this page againſt *R. B.* which is as he ſays for perverting Scripture and adding a new term (as he calls it) namely the word [Light [to the Text, *John.* 3. 16. that he *may* (ſays the Bp.) *prove Chriſt as a Light given to all.* And yet at the ſame time, he picks out this word, he takes no notice of the Multitude of Scriptures, which *R. B.* has cited to prove the ſufficiency and univerſality of the Light; only he tells us *he* (*R. B.*) *miſapplies two or three Texts to prove this Light univerſal*, but not a word how or wherein. But to the word [Light] 'tis ſo plain on *R. B's.* ſide, as having no ſuch perverting intention, that we cannot believe but the Bp's. Conſcience muſt know he wronged *R. B.* in this caſe as well as in

what follows hereafter, which we ſhall ſhew; only in the firſt place let us take the Bp. in his own way about the Light; Then ſay we, if that Text might have proved Chriſt, a Light given to all, had the word Light been there, then certainly he's proved ſuch, if we bring ſeveral Scriptures as full to the point; thus, *John* 1. 4. *In him was life, and the Life was the Light of Men.* Verſ. 9. *He was* (viz. Chriſt) *the true Light which lighteth every Man that cometh into the World.* What can be more plain as to the univerſality of the Light of Chriſt. Again Chap. 8. 12. *I am* (ſaith Chriſt) *the Light of the World, he that followeth me, ſhall not walk in darkneſs, but ſhall have the Light of Life*; which Texts ſufficiently prove that *Chriſt is a Light to all.* And certainly the Bp. ſought for an occaſion while he pickt out that Word, to Accuſe *R. B.* tho' at the ſame time does not confute thoſe Scriptures with ſeveral others brought both by *R. B.* and *W. P.* to prove the Light of Chriſt within, unleſs by falſifying the ſenſe of thoſe Texts noted before (*p.* 57.) Now to the perverſion and addition charged by the Bp. upon *R. B.* with much noiſe, obſerve, Reader, the word [Light] is in the Theſis of *R. B's.* fifth Propoſition in his *Apology*, where he has no leſs then five Scripture Texts, and there is not any one

of

of all the five laid down in the exact and full words of Scripture, ſome of them very ſhort, as well as differing in words; and in particular this very Text, *John* 3. 16. cited by the Bp. are neither the full, nor yet all of them the exact words of that Text; Beſides the word Light, and indeed the five Texts, he there gave, were only a kind of References to Scriptures, which proved the Argument he was upon, namely the univerſality of the love of God through Chriſt Jeſus, who was the Light of the World and Light of Men: Now we'l grant, if *R. B.* had laid down all theſe Texts as the entire words of Scripture, and that he could not plainly prove *Chriſt the Light of Men*, then had he been in the wrong and the Bp. in the right; but ſince the firſt are not ſo, and that he as well as we have ſhewn by plain Scripture Chriſt to be the Light of Men, we think 'tis but too plain the Bp. wanted an occaſion, while he made this one, for in reading *R. B's.* Explanation and Defence of this Propoſition, where in, *p.* 81. We find the full and entire words of that Text laid down thus, *John* 3. 16. *God ſo loved the World that he gave his only begotten Son, that who ſo ever believed in him, ſhould not periſh but have everlaſting Life.* Now, candid Reader, judg in the matter, which is moſt obvious, the Bp's. partiality

by indeavouring to misrepresent *R. B.* or *R. B's.* intention to pervert and add a new term to Scripture, when he had not the least need of it, and had several other plain Scriptures to prove the point.

The rest of *p.* 12. and part of 13. is mostly a recital of pickt words here and there taken out of *R. B's. Apology*, and as we said before, some far distant added together, upon some of which, the Bp. puts his own false constructions, and yet in conclusion, we do not find he pretends to confute them by any other Arguments then by his own Assertion, as *p.* 12. he tells us *by the way he does not think this Scripture Language*; and *p.* 13. avers *'tis unintelligible, that is Banter*; so that we need take no further notice then only refer the Reader to *R. B's. Apology*, where (if he be impartial) he will find full satisfaction: However in regard the Bp. doth greatly abuse *R. Bp's.* sense, we will take notice and answer, such his recitalls.

Thus (*p.* 12.) the Bp. cites some words out of *R. B's.* Discourse on the sixth Proposition of his *Apology*, where *R. B.* was proving that *the seed, Light, or Grace of God* is no *accident*, but a real *Spiritual substance.* Then says the Bp. *of their feeling it, yea anon Tasting, Smelling, seeing it, and handling by virtue of it the things of God,*

which

which yet (says the Bp.) *are certainly all Spiritual things. Again the* Bp. goes on (*p.* 13.) *that people should be able to smell, and feel, and handle things, which being intellectual and immaterial can no ways be incident to these Senses, nor are so much as ever Metaphorically said to be smelt, or handled; the Bp. avers unintelligible, that is Banter*: Then he tells us he expects our Reply, that he is a *carnally minded Man, to whom all this seems strange*, which he will answer *anon.*

Answ. First, the Bp. in this case, might as well have expected to be taxed with great *unfairness* in wilfully abusing *R. B's.* sense, as that he is a *carnally minded Man*, and that he is guilty of the first, and such a Man in the last, we think nothing can well be plainer; while in the first he makes *R. B.* to allude to outward senses, whereas the Scope of his Arguments, as well as his plain Words do prove the contrary: thus, *p.* 95. *R. B's. Apology*, (and the same Section cited by the Bp. (which he makes, 16. but it should be Sect. 14.) '*We come to have those Spiritual Senses raised,* '*by which we are made capable of Tasting, Smel-*' *ling Seein gand Handling the things of God.* And in plain opposition to outward Senses, which the Bp. would insinuate, he intended, says in the next words, for a '*Man can-*' *not reach unto those things, by his natural*

Spirit

Spirit and Senſes as is above declared: Pray, Reader, judg in the matter, can there be a plainer abuſe put upon a Man, while the Bp. oppoſes intellectual and immaterial things, and Spiritual Senſes, to what *R. B.* intended, when *R. B's.* plain words intends *Spiritual*, in oppoſition to *Natural* Senſes.

Next as to the *Seed, Light, and Grace of God*, which the Bp. cites. *p.* 12. and which *R. B.* ſays *is a real Spiritual Subſtance, which the Soul is able to feel and apprehend, from which that real inward Spiritual birth in Believers ariſes, called the New Creature, and New Man in the heart.* Now for confirming *R. B's.* expreſſions to be ſound and Spiritual. both in this Citation, as alſo in relation to Spiritual Senſes, we ask the Bp. what New Creature the Apoſtle meant. 2 *Cor.* 5. 17. *Gal.* 6. 15. And what that hidden Man of the heart was the Apoſtle ſpoke of, 1 *Pet.* 3. 4. And what thoſe *Senſes* were, 1 *John* 1. 1. by which the Apoſtle *ſaw*, *felt*, and *handled* the word of Life; Then what *taſte* that was *Pſ.* 34. 8. *O taſte* and *ſee that the Lord is good*; And what that ſweet *ſavour* was, 2 *Cor.* 2. 15. *Sweet Smell*, *Cant.* 4. 9, 11. *Chap.* 7. 13. Now, Reader, judg in the matter, might not the Bp. with much reaſon, if he had conſidered rightly, have expected to be termed a Carnaly minded Man by

by us, while he rendered *R. B.* guilty of unintelligible *Banter. P.* 12. the Bp. tells us *R. B.* will have this *Light or Grace the purchaſe of Chriſts Death* for every Man, *lightning the hearts of all in a day, and ſubſiſts in the hearts of wicked Men, even whilſt they are in their wickedneſs, which the Bp. tells us he thinks not Scripture Language.*

Anſw. That *R. B.* hath fully and undeniably owned and aſſerted the Attonement and Sacrifice of Jeſus Chriſt in (*p.* 96.) of his *Apology*; as alſo in the ſeventh Propoſition about Juſtification, we ſuppoſe the Bp. will not deny, and in the firſt doth make an eſpecial exception againſt being miſunderſtod in that point, while he was treating of the neceſſity of obeying the Light and Grace of Chriſt, in order to receive the benefits of his death and ſufferings for us: why then might not he ſay this Seed, Light Grace or Spirit of Chriſt, was the purchaſe of his death, ſince it came by him; ſee *John* 1. 17. *The Law came by Moſes but Grace and Truth by Jeſus Chriſt.* Again *John* 1. 4, 9. *Rom.* 8. 9. *John* 16. 7. 13. And that it *ſubſiſts* in the Wicked, tho' in a far different manner then in the Righteous (as *R. B.* excellently ſhews), ſee *Luke* 17. 21. *The Kingdom of Heaven within*: The wicked Phariſees, *Mat.* 25. 25. The wicked ſervant had a *Talent* tho' he did not

not *improve* it: Now is it not ſtrange the Bp. ſhould overlook many more Scriptures then theſe, while he was ſo trifling with *R. B.*

Ibid. 12. The Bp. tells us that *R. B.* ſays *That the knowledge of Chriſts death and ſufferings, as declared in the Scripture, is not abſolutely neceſſary for making people partakers of this Light.* Again P. 13. *The knowledge of the Scripture, tho' comfortable and profitable, is not needful.*

Anſw. We have already, in Anſwer to the four points laid down by the Bp. as, *G.K's.* (*p.* 45. 46.) ſpoken to this point and therefore need ſay the leſs here, nor do we find the Bp. pretends to confute it; Nay tells us, as to that part, which lyes in (*p.* 12.) that *R. B.* proves it *after his way*: And as to that part in (*p.* 13.) the Bp. has neither fairly cited it, nor told the occaſion, for *R. B.* ſpoke in reference to ſuch, from whom the knowledg of the Death and ſufferings of Chriſt hath been with-held; to ſuch ſays *R. B.* it is not *abſolutely needful*, ſo as they may be ſaved, notwithſtanding, they have not the outward Hiſtory, provided they obey the Light and Spirit of God, (which he plainly proves, is given univerſally to all) And thereby, from *unholy* become *holy* Men: We deſire thee, Reader, to peruſe *R. B's.* fifth and ſixth Propoſitions

ſitions for full ſatisfaction to all the Bp's. Objections.

P. 13. The Bp. proceeds thus; *By what has been produced out of* R. B. *in his own words, it appears Mr.* Penn's *double and agreeing Teſtimony of the Light within and the Scriptures of Truth without, is but a New bubble upon the World, a thin Leaf of Gold, to make the poiſonous Pill of their Light within go down with the leſs reluctancy or even ſuſpition.*

Anſw. As to the Bp's. picking out, and putting falſe conſtructions upon *R. B's.* and *W. P's.* words, we have obſerved to the Reader already; Next as to the agreeing Teſtimony, we have ſpoken to that before, to which we refer.

Laſtly as to his Calling the Light within a Poyſonous Pill, we hope he will not blame *W. P.* or any other for ſaying he has no ſhare in it, while he thus reviles it, and how far the Expreſſion may Affect the Bp. in the ſight of the Lord we Leave: But to be plain, had we (who believe in the Light of Chriſt) uttered ſuch words, we ſhould have concluded our ſelves guilty of little leſs then Blaſphemy; Nor do we ſee how his ſalvo of calling it the Quakers Light will excuſe him, ſince we have always declared it to be the Light of Jeſus Chriſt, and univerſaly given to all Men, often teſtified unto in the holy Scriptures.

The

The latter end of (*p.* 13. and 14.) The Bp. exclaims againſt *W. P.* for mentioning many Reformers and Martyrs in concurrence with us as to the double and agreeing teſtimony of the Spirit of God within, and the Scriptures of Truth without; but ſays the Bp. *without producing one word out of them or referring to any Treatiſe or Page.*

Anſw. If the Bp. had firſt confuted the Scripture Teſtimonies, *W. P.* laid down directly proving the ſufficiency of the Light, Grace, and Spirit of God within, he would have had the better pretence to have harrangued upon *W. P.* about theſe Authors; but that he did not, for a good reaſon indeed, becauſe he could not. And as to thoſe Authors, if the Bp. had publiſhed his Anſwer while *W. P.* was in *England*, he might have receiv'd a fuller antwer from himſelf then we can give, he being a Perſon (to be ſure) better read then we are. However, we queſtion not in the leaſt, but *W. P.* had good ground for what he aſſerted, tho' at the ſame time we think 'tis plain, he laid no ſuch great ſtreſs upon their Authority, ſeing he referred not to particular Treatiſe or Page; and what need for it, ſince he quoted Chapter and Verſe, of an undeniable authority, *viz.* the Scriptures. But why is the Bp. ſo loud againſt *W. P.* for what he is ſo guilty of himſelf, he

he tells us, *That* Luther, Melancthon, Zuinglius, and Calvin, *as well as other Reformers, and Reformed, generally hold among other points Three, that are expreſly contrary to what the Quakers teach of the Light within*; And ſo goes on to tell us, what thoſe Three points are, and after all not one word in what Book, Treatiſe, or Page, we ſhould find any one of them: Now is it not ſtrange the Bp. ſhould ſo inconſiderately fall into the ſame Errour, he but juſt before charged upon *W. P.* or muſt it be a Fault in *W. P.* and none in the Bp.

But the Bp. tells us *he fairly avers it and takes upon him to prove it if Mr. P. or his Abetters ſhall deny it*, &c.

Anſw. If he does it no better, then ſomethings we have noted him, not only ſhort but unfair in before, we have but too much cauſe to believe his proofs will be very lame: But to end this Diſpute and come nearer home, let the Bp. but fairly refute the many Scripture Teſtimonies quoted by *R.B.W.P.* and ſome by us to prove the ſufficiency of the Light, Grace, and Spirit of God within Man, given as a ſure Guide and Director, &c. to him, and he will do the work fully without either troubling the Reformers or Martyrs.

(*P.* 15.) The Bp. goes on thus; *If they* (i. e. the Quakers) *ſhall ſay, the*

Bp.

Bp. wrongs them in ſaying, they make their Light within the rule of their actions at any time, without or againſt holy Scripture, beſides what may be produced out of their Books, by way of Doctrine, and particularly W. P. (*p.* 105.) *let them anſwer among others to theſe two matters of fact.*——*One* Knight *on a certain Lords day, in the time of Divine worſhip, came into the Congregation.*——*And ſtood there ſtark naked.*——*Crying out, behold here the naked Truth.*——*Again one* Workman *in the town of* Roſs.——*Gave out for a miracle he would faſt*——*Forty days; But tho' he gave off, before the Forty Days were near at an end, Yet it was diſcovered, that in a Rick of Beans near his Chamber, he had made a great hole, and devoured a ſuitable quantity of them.*

Anſw. (1*ſt.*) As to *W. P's.* Doctrine (*p.* 105.) If falſe Doctrine, why does not the Bp. confute it, he tells us in (*p.* 2.) he ought not to connive, but why then doth he do it here, and not only here but before, for this is the place we complained of before, wherein he made a great Out-cry againſt *W. P.* for falſifying the Senſe of the Scripture. *John* 3. 21. about the Light, And at the ſame time was wholly ſilent to the many other Scriptures which followed, and which *W. P.* brought to prove the Light and Spirit of God within Men: Doth the

Bp.

Bp. think to come off thus by calling it falſe Doctrine, without proving it ſuch, we think 'twill hardly paſs, unleſs with very credulous Readers. Surely if the Bp. had well conſidered what he ſaid or well obſerved what the holy Scripture ſaith, he would ſcarce have quoted that page for falſe Doctrine above any other in that Book, great part of it being Texts of Scripture, ſo full to the point he had in hand that hardly any thing can be more plain: Reader ſee 105. firſt, and 115, 116, pages ſecond Impreſſion. (*2ly.*) As to the Story of *Knight* the Inſtance of which looks as if the Bp. would go far, rather than want matter to defame the Quakers withall (it being about 26 Years Old) we hardly ſuppoſe the Bp. gives this ſtory of *Knight*'s nor yet *Workman*'s from his own certain knowledge; if from report, (as we underſtand he doth) would it look well in a Quaker to take a ſtory out of the *Cobler of Gloſter* concerning a Prieſt or Bp. and ſpread it as the Bp. hath done, let him conſider of it. As to the Story it is not true in all its parts (as laid down by the Bp.) according to our beſt Information, for we have made full enquiry into the matter, and do find, that altho' he did go, and ſtand naked before the Congregation, yet that he never ſaid theſe words (*behold here the naked Truth*) for

the Bp. may aſſure himſelf, had *Knight* ſpoke ſuch words, the Quakers would have been as ready to diſown him with abhorrance of ſuch Expreſſions, as the Bp. is to Aſperſe the Quakers with the Story; and how ready he is at that, we leave the Reader to judg: But as to *John Knight* (for ſo was his name) the Man is dead, and cannot anſwer for himſelf, but his Widow gives the relation of the words he ſpoke, as he gave them to her, which are theſe: [*As odious as I ſeem in your eyes, ſo odious are your actions in the ſight of the Lord.*] And how odious the Actions of that Congregation was in the ſight of the Lord, the Lord beſt knows; And as to *Knight*'s call to that ſervice, we ſhall leave it to the Lord; But this we can ſay, we never knew or heard otherwiſe, but that he was a very ſober, honeſt, and Religious Man, and ſo continued to his end, which Character we believe, all who knew him will give of him.

Thirdly, As to the ſtory of *John Workman*; according to our beſt information that ſtory, is not true as related by the Bp. the Man being alſo dead, his Widow has given a Narrative of the whole under her hand, too long to be inſerted here, but to give it in ſhort; She ſays, He never gave out at all (much leſs as a *Miracle*) neither pretended to faſt any certain time, for when he

he was asked the Queſtion, by her ſelf and others, he anſwered, he could not tell how long he was to faſt, that was hid from him, the time was until he had *freedom from the Lord to eat*: She farther ſays, She is fully aſſured he did really faſt Thirty days, in which time he eat nothing, only at ſometimes, waſhed his Mouth with ſmall beer or water, and at times drank a little water. ——Then as to the *Bean Stack being near the Chamber where he lay, and that he made a great hole, and devoured a ſutable quantity of them*, ſhe ſays it is utterly falſe, for there was no ſuch thing near his Chamber, and that his Haggard of Corn lay at ſome diſtance from the Houſe; But this ſhe remembers, that ſuch a Lie was forged by a Light Frollickſome Fellow at *Roſs*, who kept an Ale-houſe, and to make his Tipling Gueſts merry, raiſed this lying Story, upon that *honeſt Man*, for ſo we call him, and ſo he was reputed by his neighbours, and one that abhorred deceit, and lying, and therefore his reallity in this thing is the leſs to be queſtioned, and if the Bp. can diſprove him to be ſuch, by credible witneſſes, or the Story otherwiſe, then as we have told, he may do it if he can. And ſo we proceed to the Bp's. demand.

Ibid. (15.) *The Bp's demands of Mr.* P. , *Whether every ſtrong impulſe of mind is to*

be followed, as being the Light within, if not, what have we to try the Light within by, if it be ſaid Scripture, agreed; but can Mr. P. *produce, a double and agreeing record for theſe, and the like actions?*

Anſw. As to the Bp's. demand, *Is every ſtrong impulſe of the mind to be followed as being the Light within?* We anſwer no, nor doth it therefore follow, becauſe ſome hath falſly pretended to the Spirit of God, that therefore the true motions of the Spirit, are to be rejected; No more then becauſe falſe Prophets and Teachers pretended to be ſent of God, that therefore the Spirit in the true Prophets and Teachers ought not to be regarded; Nor more then becauſe ſome, who have preferred the *Scriptures* to be their rule of faith and practice, miſtaking and perverting the Senſe of the *Scripture*, have held or practiſed wrong things, therefore the holy *Scripture* ſhould be wholly rejected, and nothing believed or done that is therein declared or recommended; And as to our Doctrines and Practices, we do not refuſe in matters of controverſy with our Adverſaries to have both tryed by the *holy Scriptures*, and here may be a fit place, to anſwer a Charge or Reflection of the Bp's. in this Paragraph, viz. *There is no project ſo wild, that their pretended Light within may not lead them into.*

Anſw.

Anſw. We utterly deny the conſequence, and ſay the Light of Chriſt which we profeſs to be led by, did never lead any either into wildneſs or immorality; but on the contrary, ſuch as follow it, are led by it into godlineſs and ſobriety, according to the agreeing record, *Titus* 2. 11, 12. *Eph.* 5. 9, 10. 1 *John* 2. 27. And if any coming among us, and pretending to be of us, are guilty of Immoral practices, we have *Church Diſcipline*, by which we deal with and diſown ſuch as the nature of the Caſe may require. Then as to Doctrines and Practices upon a religious account, if any ſhould under pretence of the *Light within* broach any evil Doctrine, or act any thing repugnant to or againſt the Teſtimony of the holy Scriptures, we diſown ſuch Doctrines or practices; knowing, that as every evil thing, contradicts the Scriptures, ſo it really doth the Spirit from whence the holy Scriptures came, and conſequently in reallity, they cannot oppoſe one another. Now as to thoſe two Inſtances brought by the Bp. which he demands a double record for, if he means going Naked, or Faſting, without his other untrue Circumſtances,

We anſwer, tho' we neither ſay nor allow ſuch extraordinary things, as appearing naked ought to be done by imitation, or becauſe ſome of the Lords ſervants did ſo of

Old: Yet he may remember we have examples in holy Scripture for both. Did not the Prophet *Iſaiah* walk *naked and bare footed*, three Years as a *ſigne*? *Iſaiah* 20, 2, 3. And how was he, and the Prophet *Ezekiel* as *Signes* and *Wonders* to the wicked, in what the Lord required of them? many Inſtances of which we could produce, but for brevity ſake we omit them. And as to *Faſting*, we have ſo many examples of that kind in both Old and New Teſtaments, that we think it needleſs to bring any proof for that practice. Thus having reply'd to the Bp's. demand we proceed,

Ibid. P. 15. The Bp. ends this Paragraph, with telling us he could have aſſigned more *immoral inſtances*, but has forborn: And to end this Paragraph, we muſt tell him our thoughts, which are, that if he could have gotten either more, or ſuch as he thought would have rendered the Quakers more odious, we are doubtful whether his good inclinations to the Quakers, would have been ſo prevalent on him, as to have forborn on that account.

(*P.* 16.) *Notice ſhould be given* (ſays the Bp. of *W. P.*) of his repeated cunning, as well as unfaithfulneſs in citing another particular Writer, againſt the Bp. his cunning (and Mr. *P.* ought to have remembred, who lately Printed that amongſt his Maxims,

Maxims, that *Cunning borders upon Knavery.*) *In that he never produces his Authors words, and his unfaithfulneſs in repreſenting the ſenſe widely different, if not contrary to what it is*; Ouzelius *in his notes on* Minutius Felix *tells us the primitive Chriſtians forbore the Heatheniſh cuſtoms, and particularly therefore, they rejected the Cuſtom of Crowning their Dead with Garlands, this Mr.* P. *refers to, (if he refer,) to any thing to be found in that Author.* Thus the Bp.

Anſw. 'Tis no news for the Bp. to make much of a little, as well as much ado to no very great purpoſe againſt *W. P.* pray Reader ſee *W. P's. Defence, p.* 71. and there thou wilt find, he doth mention ſome of his Authors words, contrary to what the Bp. hath aſſerted; Thus *W. P.* 'I beſeech 'him (*i. e.* the Bp.) to converſe with 'Ouzelius upon *Minutius Felix*, and he will 'tell him, that the firſt Chriſtians were taxed, 'and deſpiſed for ill bred in Manners, unpo-'liſhed in Speech, unfaſhionable in Behavi-'our; in fine, Ruſticks and Clowns, as the 'Chriſtians ironicaly returned their Scorners 'the ſtile of well bred and Eloquent; this 'and much more he cites out of *Lactan-'tius, Theodoret and Arnobius*, &c.

This is what *W. P.* has in that page, exactly as it lyes there; Now judg in the matter, Candid Reader, who is moſt guilty of cunning, and unfaithfulneſs, *W. P.* in

citing his Authors words as above, or the Bp. in ſaying he did not, and taking no notice or giving any anſwer, to that large Quotation. And beſides, if we miſtake not, the Bp. hath given his own Church a great wound, by the above citation out of that Author, who, as the Bp. ſays, *forbore heatheniſh cuſtoms, and particularly they rejected, Crowning the Dead with Garlands*; upon which the Bp. asks thus; *Is there no difference betwixt Idolatrous Rites and the innocent Faſhions of Chriſtians ordinary apparel?* So that we think he makes *Crowning the Dead with Garlands an Idolatrous Rite*, as well as *a heatheniſh cuſtom*; upon which we ask, what ſort of Rite or Cuſtom that is in a certain Church which makes fine Garlands for the Dead, hanging them up in their Worſhip Houſes, with long ſtreaming Eſcutcheons? to ſay nothing of covering the Dead with them. Let the Bp. conſider the matter. But notwithſtanding, what we have ſaid, we have not yet done with the Bp. upon this head of cunning and unfaithfulneſs; we obſerve, the Bp. has made a great ado and ſpent good part of a page about *Ouzelius*, &c. to fix this charge upon *W. P.* without reaſon. Now we ask the Bp. whether he had not ſomething like *cunning*, in this to amuſe his Reader, while at the ſame time he ſkipt over ſeveral other Authors

thors, ſome of whoſe Treatiſes were cited by *W. P.* concerning the Care and Zeal, which ſome of the antients had to ſuppreſs *Heatheniſh* cuſtoms in Manners and Behaviour from getting in upon Chriſtians; ſee *W. P. Defence, p.* 71, 72. But that which is more obſervable is, that altho' *W. P.* brought ſeveral Scriptures, Chap. and Verſ. againſt conforming to the World, in their *Faſhions, Dreſſes* and *Apparel*, and particularly *Rom.* 12. 1, 2. 1 *Peter* 1. 13, 14. *Chap.* 3. 3. yet the Bp. takes no notice of all thoſe Scriptures (tho' they were brought by *W. P.* in Anſwer to the *Bp's. Teſtimony*, in which he put *W. P.* upon the Proof to ſhew the primitive Chriſtians differed from others of their Nation, and Quality in ſuch things) Now what imaginable reaſon can be given, why the Bp. ſhould make ſo much ado, (and without cauſe too) about *Minutius Felix*, *&c.* while he was ſilent to all the reſt of *W. P's.* proofs: But to conclude about that of Apparel and Dreſſes we ſhall only ſay, It is much to be lamented, that ſo great an Overſeer as the Bp. ſhould (by not more publickly *appearing againſt*) tacitly *plead for* and countenance ſuch abominable *pride* (in Apparel and Dreſſes by calling them *innocent faſhions*) as is found reigning amongſt the generality of thoſe called Chriſtians in our day: As to what the

Bp.

the Bp. tells us of *Octavius* that the Christians *knew one another only by their Innocence and Humility and not by any bodily mark.*

We *Answer*, the Bp. may know not only *Innocence* and *Humility* was a sign that *Peter* belonged to *Jesus*, but his *Speech* also, *Matt.* 26. 73. Again the *boldness of unlearned and ignorant* Men was another mark, *Acts* 4. 13. But to the next.

Ibid. 16. The Bp. goes on, *and as to their language, after all artifices Mr.* P. *has not been able to produce (which was a pressing point of his business) one precedent or shaddow of a Testimony that the primitive Christians used not the ordinary Civilities in their common Discourse, and Salutations, but affected a different Style or way by themselves; contrarily he might have remembered that the beloved Disciple, being to write to a Christian Sister of Quality salutes her by an inscription, To the Elect Lady.*

Answ. We must needs say we cannot but greatly admire at the Bp. thus with an artificial flourish to assert against his own knowledge, while he wilfuly overlookt *W. P's.* Arguments relating to this particular case of Salutations; see his *Defence. p.* 73, 74. there thou wilt find he plainly *proves, Matt.* 23. 6, 7, 8. *Luke* 10. 4. from Christs own words, both his condemnation upon the Pharisees for loving honour, and salutary greetings,

greetings, and particularly in affecting to be called *Rabbi*; as also his positive command to his Disciples, against such practices of being called *Masters*. Again, *W. P.* Quotes Christs Question to the Jews, viz. *How can ye believe, which receive honour one of another, and seek not the honour that cometh from God only*, John 5. 44. And after all this, with more, to tell us *W. P.* has not been *able to produce one precedent or shadow of a Testimony, that the primitive Christians used not the ordinary Civilities in their common discourse and Salutations*, is, we think as much as to tell us, that they obeyed not the command of Christ, or if they did, that the Sun doth not shine when it appears in its greatest Lustre. Then as to Language.

If the Bp. means *Thee* and *Thou* to a single person, we find in holy Writ all sorts used it then, which if all did now, there would be no difference in that point between us and any other sort of people: We could say much upon the fullsome and flattering Titles and Complements of the times, which, to be sure, no precedent is to be found in the Scriptures for, and particularly those Titles given to the Bp's. far beyond, and above, what ever was given to *Timothy*, or any others that we read of in holy Scripture, who yet were endued with the Spirit and power of God beyond what any of our

Bishops

Biſhops will pretend to: But we ſtudy brevity and will therefore be ſhort upon this Head, only before we end we muſt anſwer to the Title of the *Elect Lady*, who, the Bp. tells us, was a Chriſtian Siſter of Quality, but *Dr. Hammond* a perſon of great note in the *Church of England* in his *Annotations on the New Teſtament* tells us, that direction 2 *John* 1. to the *Elect Lady*, will be beſt rendered, *to the Elect Church or Congregation*, ſee *Wilſons Chriſtian Dictionary* more largely: *Verbum Lady:* and if ſo as *Hammond* ſays, the Bp. is miſtaken in that Inſcription, to be ſure at leaſt, that *he* and the *Bp. differ* in their Opinions therein. But as to the word *Lady*, as it ſignifies a particular perſon, it is our practice ſometimes to call a *Lady*, the *Lady ſuch an one:* or a *Lord*, the *Lord ſuch an one*; which is no more then to ſay *ſuch a Lord, or ſuch a Lady, ſo called*; not *my Lord*, nor *my Lady*, and ſo we end this Paragraph.

The Bp's. next head *p.* 16, 17. is about *Water Baptiſm*, in which he does, as in other caſes (as we take it, for want of better Arguments) endeavour to miſrepreſent *W. P's.* ſenſe, as we ſhall plainly demonſtrate in what follows; he begins thus,

The Bp. ſincerely profeſſes he mourns to ſee Men ſo hardened as it appears by Mr. P's. *wreſting Scripture to elude the Truth. Mr.* P. *firſt*

firſt in a manner confeſſeth himſelf put to his ſhifts; I am ſenſible of the diſadvantage I am under, &c. *ſaith he; Yet proceeds he to ſhift on.*

Anſw. We have little cauſe to believe the Bp's. *mourning* is *real*, while he continues to abuſe, as well as miſrepreſent us, as he doth; however let his mourning be of what ſort it will, 'twas needleſs here, becauſe 'tis without ground, for we deny *W. P.* doth either *wreſt Scripture* or *elude the Truth*; But on the other hand 'tis very plain, the Bp. doth here wreſt *W. P's.* words to ſute his own turn, not only in not laying down his following words but wrongly applying thoſe he has laid down. Now *W. P's.* words are theſe, *viz.* 'I am ſenſible of the 'diſadvantage I lye under, and that I touch 'a tender place, and what I ſay upon this 'Head,& alſo anon upon the Supper,will be 'againſt wind and tide with the generality.

Now, Reader, judg, doth *W. P.* in a manner confeſs himſelf put to his *ſhifts*, or doth he not rather expreſs himſelf thus, with reſpect to the people who are generally in the practice of *Water Baptiſm*, and the *outward Supper*, and conſequently therefore did believe, the harder to be prevailed upon by his Arguments, and this we take to be no more, then if the Bp. were writing againſt the Papiſts in a received Tenet of the Church

Church of *Rome*; Suppoſe *Tranſubſtantiation*; might not the Bp. with a great deal of reaſon ſay (with reſpect to them) *I am ſenſible of the diſadvantage I lye under*, &c. would this be in a manner confeſſing he was put to his ſhifts ? but we have more of the ſame kind, nay worſe in what follows: The Bp. proceeds to vindicate his allegation in his *Teſtimony*, viz.

P. 17. *The Bp. had avouched thoſe words of our Lord*, Matt. 28. 19. *was an Inſtitution and command of Baptiſm with Water, and gave two ſubſtantial reaſons, which he holds to, Baptizing with the holy Ghoſt was not in the Apoſtles power, therefore it could not be the thing commanded them.* (2ly.) *Baptizing with Water was the Apoſtles and primitive practice and has been ever ſince the practice of the Church. To the firſt of theſe Mr.* P. *anſwereth ; it is not true ; and to make that good alledges*, Acts 10. 44. *while* Peter *yet ſpoke theſe words the holy Ghoſt fell on all thoſe that heard the word. Hence he infers, that* Peter *Baptized* Cornelius *with the holy Ghoſt : Now was there ever any thing more impertinent and inconſequent ? while* Peter *ſpoke*, &c. *the holy Ghoſt fell on them*, &c. *therefore (which was the point to be proved) was it* Peter's *act and in his power to Baptize with the holy Ghoſt ? no the Spirit breatheth where it liſteth*, John 5. 8. *But God (ſays Mr.* P. *) by the Apoſtles*

Apoſtles did Baptize Believers with the holy Ghoſt, (to which the Bp. anſwers, as we take it tacitly granting the matter, *Did he ſo?*) *Then 'twas God Baptized them with the holy Ghoſt, and not the Apoſtles; they were only inſtruments at pleaſure, as long as the act was not principally theirs, it cannot be concluded hence to have been in their power.* Thus the Bp.

Anſw. Reader, we muſt deſire thy excuſe for this long citation, we could not well avoid it for the following reaſons; (1*ſt.*) Let a Man act ever ſo warily 'tis much if his words be not perverted, as the Bp. hath done by *W. P.* on this point. (2*ly.*) It will in part appear, from the Bp's. own words, (tho' to be ſure not deſignedly) how unfair he has been unto *W. P.* in repreſenting him, as if *W. P.* had ſaid, 'twas in the Apoſtles power *of themſelves to Baptize* with the *holy Ghoſt*, tho' at the ſame time in a kind of contradiction to himſelf, as a Salvo, adds; *But God, ſays Mr.* P. *by the Apoſtles, did Baptize Believers with the holy Ghoſt*; But then with a ſhort turn, Query's (as if *W. P.* had been of another mind before) *Did he ſo? Then 'twas God Baptized*, &c. Now, *Sober Reader*, we muſt deſire thy farther patience, in citing *W. P's.* own words, as they lye in one entire Paragraph of his *Defence* (*p.* 76.) which will not only

only diſcover the Bp's. falſe repreſentation of *W. P.* but fully clear up the matter, that *W. P.* never intended or meant, 'twas barely in the Apoſtles power to *Baptize* with the *holy Ghoſt*: Thus *W. P.* viz. 'I ſay then 'the Bp's. firſt reaſon is not true, for God 'by the Apoſtles did Baptize Believers with 'the holy Ghoſt, it fell upon them by the 'powerful preaching of the word; thus 'act. 10. 44. while *Peter* yet ſpake theſe 'words, the holy Ghoſt fell on them that 'heard: By which it is evident, that *Peter* 'in that Sermon was the Miniſter of the 'Spiritual Baptiſm, to *Cornelius* and his 'company. *Now*, *Impartial Reader*, judg in the matter, was it poſſible for a Man to ſpeak more plain, then *W. P.* doth here, that 'twas *God* by the *Apoſtles*, they as his Miniſters, were made able by him to *Baptize* Believers with the *holy Ghoſt*, and which was *W. P's.* point to prove, and which he did by others, as well as this Argument, tho' the Bp. has overlookt them; and what can be ſaid or who can be ſafe? tho' ever ſo plain, while it hath been the common practice of our Adverſaries to miſrepreſent us, as the Bp. hath now done by *W. P.* as if he ſhould intend 'twas in the *Apoſtles* power to *Baptize* with the *holy Ghoſt*, (ſee the Bp's. own words) But if we miſtake him not, the Bp. himſelf ſeems to allow, that

that God did *inſtrumentally Baptize* Believers, with the *holy Ghoſt*, (we are ſure we intend not to wrong his Senſe, but his words to us ſeems to import no leſs,) while he ſaith, *Did he ſo? Then 'twas God Baptized with the holy Ghoſt and not the Apoſtles, they were only inſtruments at pleaſure, as long as the act was not principally theirs it cannot be concluded hence to have been in their power.* Nor did *W. P.* ever intend 'twas in the *Apoſtles* power, only as *Inſtruments* in *God's hand*, and by his power and at his pleaſure, they *Baptized* Believers with the *holy Ghoſt*; but whether this was the Bp's. Intention or not we will not determine, and ſo leave it, and return to the Argument, That it is plain not only from this Inſtance cited by the Bp. but by other Arguments advanced by *W. P.* (which the Bp. paſt over in ſilence) that God did *Baptize* Believers *inſtrumentally* through the *Apoſtles*, and therefore the Bp's. firſt reaſon falls, and *W. P's.* takes place. Farther, whatſoever the *Apoſtles* did in the diſcharge of their *Miniſterial Office*, whether as to *Preaching*, *Healing*, or *Baptizing*, they were but *Inſtruments*, it was all done by *God* through them, *God ſpake* through them, yet they ſaid to *ſpeak*; he *healed* through them, yet they ſaid to *heal*; ſo to *Baptize* through them, and they ſaid to *Baptize*; And they were to do none

of theſe things, till they were *endued with power from on high*, *Luke* 24.49. *Acts* 1. 4.

Ibid. (17.) The Bp. proceeds as one put to his ſhifts indeed, (to give his own Term to *W. P.* when the Bp. told him, he proceeds to ſhift on) [Thus] *Baptizing with the holy Ghoſt and with Fire, the words that Mr.* P. *alledges*, p. 69. *and runs upon was a ſpecial Prerogative of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt's predicted only of him*, *Matt.* 4. 11. (which ſhould be 3. 11.) *and fulfilled only by him*, Acts 2. *not by any Man ever Living. The Bp's. firſt reaſon then is true.* (ſays he)

Anſw. If *ſaying* were *proving* the Bp. has done it, nor will this Argument avail him any more then the former, notwithſtanding it ſeems as if he would divide *fire* from the *Baptiſm* of the *holy Ghoſt*, and only allow it to be fulfilled, *Acts* 2. Indeed if he had ſaid the *Cloven Tongues* of *fire*, it had been more tollerable, but that *fire* (i. e. the *Spiritual fire*) was to accompany the *Baptiſm* of the *holy Ghoſt*, when they were *Baptized* with the *Spirit*, is very plainly proveable from Scripture, as well from that Text which the Bp. has brought (to prove 'twas only fulfilled, *Acts.* 2.) as from others. Thus, *Matt.* 3. 11. *John* Tells many of the wicked Phariſees and Saducees which came to his *Baptiſm* and whom he called a generation of Vipers, *I indeed Baptize you with Water*

Water, &c. *but He* (Chriſt) *ſhall Baptize you with the holy Ghoſt and with fire*: As if he had ſaid, you, or who ever are *Baptized* with the *Baptiſm* of Chriſt ſhall be *Baptized* with the *holy Ghoſt, and with fire.* Now we ſuppoſe the Bp. will hardly plead that all thoſe *John* then did ſpeak unto, were of that number, *Acts.* 2. conſequently then *Fire* accompanied with the *holy Ghoſt*, was to extend to others as well as it did to thoſe Diſciples, *Acts.* 2. which we ſhall farther prove: In the mean time with reſpect to the Bp's. opinion in the matter, as we cannot wonder at it, ſo neither do we think him a *competent Judg*, whether *Fire* accompanies the *Baptiſm* of the *Spirit* or not; becauſe we do not find he pretends to the *holy Ghoſt*, unleſs to be obtained by outward means; however let the Bp's. opinion be what it will, we cannot but admire he ſhould affirm ſo contrary to plain Scripture (not only in the above but in what follows) as that the Baptiſm *predicted* Matt. 3, 11. *was only fulfilled Acts* 2. whereas if we credit the Apoſtle we ſhall find it otherwiſe; thus *Acts.* 11. 15, 16. *And as I began to ſpeak the holy Ghoſt fell on them as on us in the begining, then remembred I the word of the Lord, how he ſaid, John indeed Baptized with Water, but ye ſhall be Baptized with the holy Ghoſt*: Here *Peter* refers to the

pouring forth of the *holy Goſt*, at the time of *Pentecoſt*, and the marginal note in the Bible, refers to *Chap.* 2. 4. which ſhews that *Babtizing* with the *holy Ghoſt* was not fulfilled by Chriſt at that time mentioned *Acts.* 2. 4. but that it continued in the Church, and was diſpenſed through the Apoſtles miniſtry afterwards; ſo not fulfilled only by Chriſt as the Bp. ſaith. How then came the Bp. to fall into this miſtake, he will do well to conſider whether it be not for want of inward acquaintance with the Spirit, by which he would experimentally have witneſſed, that *Spiritual fire* doth accompany the *holy Ghoſt*. As to what he ſaith of the *prerogative of Chriſt* we aſcribe to it, as much as he can do; but then we ſay, he that *had* and *hath* all *power* in Heaven and Earth, *Matt.* 28. 18. could and did enable the Apoſtles *inſtrumentally* to *Baptize* Believers with the *holy Ghoſt*, as has been ſhewn by *W. P.* Now as to the Bp's. Second Reaſon,

Ibid. 17. That Water was the thing commanded, *Matt.* 28. 19. and that the Apoſtles practice in *Baptizing* with *Water*, was in obedience to that command; which aſſertion of his depending upon that commiſſion, we now come to conſider the ſame, by which if it appears that Water was not there commanded, it thence follows, what the

the Apoſtles did in that of Water was *practice* and not *Inſtitution*; thus the Text *Matt.* 28. 19. *Go ye therefore and teach all nations Baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the holy Ghoſt.* Now that we are not to underſtand *Water* was intended by this commiſſion appears (1*ſt.*) Becauſe here is not a word of *Water* mentioned. (2*ly.*) Becauſe the *Baptiſm* of Chriſt was the *Baptiſm* of the *Spirit*, ſpoken to in ſhort by us and more largely proved by *W. P.* (3*ly.*) Becauſe we find the Apoſtles as *inſtruments* did by the *power of God* (not of themſelves) *Baptize* Believers with the *holy Ghoſt*, as proved alſo by *W. P.* Laſtly becauſe we no where read, when the *Apoſtles* uſed Water in outward *Baptiſm*, they followed the terms of that Commiſſion (as they ought to have done had they underſtood it *Water*) by doing it *in the name of the Father, Son, and holy Ghoſt*; But did it *in the name of the Lord, or Lord Jeſus*, in which laſt form, practicers of *Water Baptiſm* in our day would (we ſuppoſe) not think it rightly performed. Now for theſe reaſons (with others, which for brevity we omit) we have no ground at all to believe that *Water* was commanded by that commiſſion; but on the contrary that the *Baptiſm* of Chriſt by his *Spirit*, was intended thereby; conſequently then what the

Apoſtles did in uſe of *Water* muſt be *practice* and not *Inſtitution*, as were the many *legal Rites*, *Circumciſion*, *Purifications*, *Vows*, *Shavings*, &c. which we find they alſo practized as well as *Water Baptiſm*, even after they had received the *holy Ghoſt*. Farther we do not find any of the Apoſtles mentioning *Water Baptiſm*, to be any part of their miſſion, nor yet recommending the practice of it, in their Epiſtles to any of the gathered Churches in the firſt ſettlement, tho' they do far leſſer things then (ſome in our day account of) *Water Baptiſm*, and ſince they are ſilent therein, we may well conclude, that their practice in that of *Water* was not from that command, *Matt.* 28. 19. but on the ſame foot they did thoſe other *Legal* things before mentioned: Nay we find that great Apoſtle *Paul* was ſo far from believing *Water Baptiſm* to be any part of his commiſſion, that he not only *thanks God* he *Baptized* no more of the *Corinthians*, 1 *Cor.* 1. 14. but adds in the. 17. Verſ. *He was not ſent to Baptize.* Again altho' he writ an Epiſtle to the *Epheſians*, and in *Acts* 20 tells them, *he had not ſhuned to declare unto them all the counſell of God*, Yet not a word of a Command for *Water Baptiſm.* But on the other hand ſpeaks of, and recommends in ſeveral Epiſtles the one *Baptiſm* of the *Spirit*, ſee, *Eph.* 4. 5. 1 *Cor.* 12. 13.

13. *Gal.* 3. 27. Thus then the Bp's. ſecond reaſon, that Water was commanded by that commiſſion falls with his firſt. Reader, be pleaſed to mind, that in what we have ſaid upon this head about *Baptiſm*, and ſhall ſay next upon the *Supper*, is not at all intended for a full diſcuſſion of theſe two points, only as direct Anſwers to the Bp's. Objections, Not ſeing any need at preſent for ſuch a Treatiſe, in regard great part of *W. P's.* Arguments upon thoſe two heads (in thirty Pages of his *Defence*) lye unanſwered by the Bp. and in particular that of *Infant Baptiſm*, which was a main and preſſing point for the Bp. to have cleared, tho' we do not find he has taken the leaſt notice of it in his *Reply*: and after all the Bp's. great talk of a divine authority for *Water Baptiſm*, 'twill be hard for him, nay beyond his power, either to find *Command* or *Example* from Scripture for what he calls *Baptiſm*. When *Water* was uſed in primitive times they *Repented*, *Believed*, and were *Baptized* (that is *dipped* or *plunged*.) Now *Infants*, neither capable of good or evil are *ſprinkled* on the Face with a little Water, a *meer humane Invention*; and as we find no command or Example in Scripture for ſuch a practice, ſo neither do we know how it can be called *Baptiſm* at all; and as this is the Bp's. Caſe, till he had proved, or at

leaſt vindicated his own practice by Scripture, from whence he pretends to judg the *Quakers*, we think he ought to have been more ſparing in his charges againſt them. Reader, if any Objections remain in thy mind, with reſpect to theſe heads of *Baptiſm* and the *Supper*, we refer thee to *W. P's. Defence* and *R. B's. Apology* who largely treat on theſe Subjects.——And to draw towards a concluſion upon the Bp's. two Reaſons, ſince it hath appeared by *W. P's. Defence* (notwithſtanding any thing the Bp. has urged to the contrary) that the Apoſtles did by the *power of God*, and as *inſtruments* in his hand, *Baptize* Believers with the *holy Ghoſt*, and ſince it doth not appear (nor can be proved) *Water* was intended by that commiſſion, *Matt.* 28. 19. It therefore follows, that the Bp's. two ſubſtantial Reaſons (as he calls them) falls to the ground. A little more we have from the Bp. about *Baptiſm*, and then for the preſent ſhall have done with this head.

(*P.* 18.) The Bp. tells us *W. P. full well knows the Church of* England *Men no more allow Water Baptiſm to be ſufficient to the Salvation of Adult Perſons, without the New Creature, or Baptiſm of the Spirit, then he does.*

Anſw. (1*ſt.*) If not to *Adult* Perſons, we Query whether the Bp. thinks *Water*

Baptiſm

Baptiſm is ſufficient to the Salvation of *Infants.* (2*ly.*) Since the *Baptiſm* of the Spirit is an *inward* work, and the *means* there, how doth this agree with what the Bp. ſays (*p.* 23.) That people are now made holy by the uſe of *outward means*, &c. Let the Bp. reconcile theſe if he can.

The Next is about the outward Supper in the uſe of *Bread and Wine*, and the Bp. begins with citing no Page, as well as ſtepping over five Pages at once of *W. P's. Defence*, tho' afterwards he looks back to carp at the words [*Wine from Heaven*] Reader ſee the *Defence. p.* 92. to 107. and compare with the Bp's. *Reply*, how little of fifteen Pages the Bp. has anſwered, as well as the former about *Baptiſm*; but perhaps the greateſt part, which lies unanſwered, are *little Cavils and poor Evaſions* with him, tho' we don't believe, they will be ſo to the Impartial Reader, This is, we confeſs, a compendious way as the Bp. told us.

P. 18. *It ſtands*, (ſaith the Bp.) (viz. the Supper) *upon the ſame immoveable foundation with the Baptiſm*, &c.

Anſw. 'Twill then follow if the Bp's. Foundation for *Water Baptiſm* be not ſound, as hath been ſhewn above, it is not, this of the *Supper* muſt be the ſame. But the Bp. proceeds with a heavy charge and exclamation againſt *W. P.* as if he were not only

only guilty of a miſtake, but in all appearance, (as he ſays) of *wilful prevarication* in *miſreporting his words*, that he might have *ſomething to except againſt* ; for ſays the Bp. of *W. P. the Bp. will have this Supper four times repeated in the New Teſtament.*——— Whereas the Bp. tells us his words reſpected the *command* for the *Supper* , and not the *Supper it ſelf* : and in concluſion of his Paragraph ends with a Queſtion thus, *Is there not a vaſt difference betwixt theſe two aſſertions, This Supper was four times repeated, and the command for the Supper is four times repeated, which laſt was moſt evidently the Bp's. ſence* ? Thus the Bp.

Anſw. 'Tis certainly a great leſſening to the Bp. to make ſo great a noiſe, to ſo little purpoſe, from whence we conclude, that either the Bp. hoped to amuſe his Reader by being ſo Critical about a word, or elſe he was very ſhort ſighted in his Argument in rendering *W. P.* guilty of *wilful prevarication*, while the Bp. overlookt his plain words, as well as ſenſe, in what followed. 'Tis true *W. P.* mentions the *Supper*, as the Bp. ſaith, *four times repeated*, but nothing can be plainer then that he intended the *command* for the *Supper*, while immediately after he has the word *command* ſeveral times over, in relation to the *Supper* : pray Reader, ſee his *Defence* (*p.* 97.) Now let us

ſee,

ſee, what ſomething *W. P.* could get againſt the Bp. by his (ſuppoſed) *wilful prevarication*, (had he intended the *Supper* and not the *command* for the *Supper*) ſurely ſay we nothing; nay ſo far from *getting*, that had he inſiſted thereon, he would have *loſt* his Argument thereby; for 'tho the *Supper* may be *four times* mentioned, the *Command for the Supper* is not four times mentioned; ſo then if *W. P.* had argued, that the *Supper* was not *four times repeated*, he had argued againſt himſelf. Now, Reader, judg in the matter, what could the Bp's. end be in ſpending a large Paragraph on this occaſion to faſten (as the Bp. ſays, in all appearance) wilful prevarication upon *W. P.*

Having cleared *W. P.* from the Bp's. Charge, which was without ground, let us now ſee, whether *W. P's.* charge of a miſtake, will not fall upon him *doubled*, with good ground. The Bp. hath aſſerted in his *Teſtimony*, the *command* for the Supper was *four times repeated* in the *New Teſtament*, which in that Paper runs thus, *Can any command be more expreſs then This Do in remembrance of me; four times repeated in the New Teſtament.*

Anſw. We muſt tell the Bp. (as *W. P.* did) it muſt be his miſtake thus to aſſert, while we cannot find the *command* ſo *repeated*,

peated, (as the Bp. ſaith) in all the *New Teſtament*, for, as *W. P.* ſaid, we muſt ſay over again, that which looks moſt like a *command* is in *Luke.* 22. 19. (to the preſent Diſciples) where he has thoſe words, *Do this in remembrance of me*? the other Evangeliſts, *Matthew and Mark*, give only a relation of the Supper, without thoſe words, and *John* ſays nothing of it at all. Then as to *Paul* he comes, 1 *Cor.* 11. and gives the *Corinthians* a *rehearſal* thereof, upon their great *abuſe* of that practice, in ſuch words as do not import a *command*, but as often as they uſed it, they *ſhewed forth the Lords Death till he came*; his words cannot be called a *command*: But ſuppoſing (not allowing) they could, yet the Bp. muſt ſtill be at a loſs, to find the *command* for the *Supper four times repeated* in theſe words, *Do this in remembrance of me?* Becauſe we do not find them but *three times* expreſsly mentioned in all the Scriptures; and but one of thoſe times, can reaſonably be called a *command* at all; if ſo it was not *repeated* at all: nor will the Bp's. Argument that the *command* was *four times repeated* hold good, unleſs he prove it *five times* mentioned, and ſo we leave it upon the Bp. and proceed.

Ibid. 18. Says the Bp. of *W. P. he proceeds to what is more dangerous* (meaning then

then the prevarication) *plainly to diffuſe his Poiſon, this coming of Chriſt was Spiritual.*

Anſw. We muſt needs ſay 'tis a very uncharitable expreſſion without cauſe, and if it were ſuch *Poiſonous Doctrine*, why did not the Bp. confute the ſubſtantial Scripture Arguments, by which *W. P.* proved his Aſſertion, which he ought to have done, before he uſed ſuch an expreſſion; But that the Bp. has not done, unleſs carping at words and reviling him be doing it, as will appear in what follows. And firſt he begins with reproaching *W. P.* for *paraphraſing* upon theſe Texts, *Matt.* 26. 29. *Mark.* 14. 25. *Luke* 22. 18. where Chriſt told his Diſciples, *He would drink no more of the fruit of the Vine, till he drank it new with them in the Kingdom of Heaven*; upon which *W. P. paraphraſed* and called *Chriſt bread and Wine from Heaven.* See his *Defence* (*p.* 98.) whereupon the Bp. reviles (according to his uſual way) and tells him, that *he and his Brethren uſes to make, and wreſt Scripture*, &c. *By Mr.* P's. *favour* (ſays the Bp.) *the Scripture no where ſtileth Chriſt Wine from Heaven.*

Anſw. If we had dealt thus with the Bp. for downright perverſions and wreſting Scripture (as we have before proved) as he hath done *W. P.* without reaſon or ground, we muſt tell the Bp. we ſhould have

have treated him at another rate then we have done. But to the matter. Where did *W. P.* ſay the Scripture ſo ſaid? he only drew a natural *conſequence* from the words of Chriſt, and the Text it ſelf is ſo plain, that it needs no comment to prove *W. P's. paraphraſe* thereon: for what *drink or Wine* was that which was to be drank in the *Kingdom of Heaven*, but *Wine from Heaven?* and who was *Wine from Heaven?* but Chriſt? who as he promiſed to *drink with them*, ſo he promiſed, *Revelations*, 3. 20. *to Sup with thoſe that opened their hearts unto him*: Now who but a Man that wanted matter and was willing to take occaſion to revile would Carp, &c. as the Bp. did, more eſpecially, while Chriſt is called a *Vine*, *Bread from Heaven*, *Water*, &c. with a multitude of other *Metaphorical Appellations* in Scripture, and had the Bp. been ſo well acquainted with the comfortable preſence of Chriſt, as a truly Spiritual Man (which he pretends to be) Really is, &c. he would never have reviled *W. P.* as he did on that account.

P. 19. The Bp. goes on telling us the Apoſtles continued the uſe of *Bread* and *Wine* after *Chriſt was Spiritually come*; therefore ſays he, *this ſhewing forth his Death till he came, was not by them underſtood of his inward and Spiritual appearance, but of his ſecond coming*

coming to Judgment; for in that Caſe feeling ſo fully, his being come in their hearts, they would have deſiſted.

Anſw. Altho' the Apoſtles did feel *Chriſt Spiritually come into their hearts*, and might alſo ſee no real *neceſſity* for keeping up this practice; yet it doth not therefore follow, they would have preſently deſiſted for theſe or the Like *Reaſons. 1ſt.* Becauſe they might think it needful to indulge the *weak* and *carnal minded Chriſtians* among them, who wanted ſuch a ſign to keep up their minds in remembrance of *Chriſts Blood*, which was *ſhed for them*; and that ſuch *weak and carnal believers* were among them appears plainly by the ſharp and reprehenſive expreſſions in the Epiſtles writ by the Apoſtles to ſome of them; likewiſe it plainly appears by Scripture, that altho *Chriſt* was come in *Spirit* to ſome, he was not ſo come in *Spirit* to others, who yet waited for his coming, ſee *James* 5.7, 8. 1 *Cor.* 1.7. Secondly, this practice might be continued among them, were it onely that we find it contributed to keep up a *Brotherly Fellowſhip* and *Communion* in the *Infancy of the Church*, which appears from, *Acts* 2.46. *and they continuing dayly with one accord in the Temple, and breaking Bread from Houſe to Houſe, did eat their meat with gladneſs, and ſingleneſs of Heart.* And here we may a little compare

the

the preſent practice of thoſe, who uſe this *Ceremony*, with thoſe in the primitive times (becauſe the Bp. has ſomething of it) Their *Breaking Bread* was joyned with *Eating their Meat*, quite contrary to the practice now adays, and not only in that, but other reſpects they diſagree, as *W. P.* hath noted. Again how widely do they differ in their opinions of the thing it ſelf, 'tis now called and believed by the *Papiſts* to be the *very Body and Blood of Chriſt*, and the *Proteſtants* in the uſe of outward *Bread and Wine*, ſay that the *Body* and *Blood of Chriſt* is in a *Spiritual manner* partaken of under that *ſign*; whereas in the primitive times, the uſe and extent thereof, as *Paul* tells us, 1 *Cor.* 11. was *in remembrance of and ſhewing forth Chriſts Death till he came*, which we believe was *Spiritual*, in relation to that *ſign*. (3*ly*.) Why might not the Apoſtles as well continue in the practice of this *ſign* (after *Chriſt was Spiritually come in their Hearts*) as in the practice of *Circumciſion*, *Purifications*, *Vows*, *Shavings* and other *legal rites*; many Inſtances of which appear plain in Scripture, which we might Inſtance but ſhall be brief and tell the Reader, that what we have and ſhall write on this head is not intended for a Treatiſe thereof, only as in Anſwer to the *Bp's. Objections*, referring the Reader as before to *W. P's. Defence*

and

and *R. B's. Apology*, who largely treats of this Subject. The Bp. proceeds,

Ibid. 19. To invalidate *W. P's.* allegation that *Baptiſm* and the *Supper* were not made an *Article* of any of the *Antient Creeds*, and thereupon tells *W. P.* thus, *he has forgot or was never Catechized as he ought to have been, or forgotten what he was taught to be the meaning of that Article, I believe the holy Catholick Church, the Communion of Saints; that is in ſhort* (ſays the Bp.) *I believe all the faithful are made one body by communion in the ſame Faith, Covenant and Ordinances of Worſhip, eſpecially Baptiſm and the Lords Supper.*

Anſw. Is it not very ſtrange that the Bp. who in *p.* 3. *tells Mr.* P. (as he called him) *as to his Paper once for all, implication of Faith is not a profeſſion of Faith*, and not only ſo, but would almoſt *unchriſtian* us, for not being more *explicit* in that Paper (*Goſpel Truths*) ſhould now tell us by believing the *holy Catholick Church, the Communion of Saints*, that the points in Queſtion namely *Baptiſm* and the *Supper*, &c. are *implyed*: We muſt needs tell him, and all may ſee that either he aſſumes a Latitude to himſelf by a ſtrange ſort of *implication*, far beyond what he will allow *W. P.* and the *Quakers*, or it muſt be confeſt *that Water Baptiſm and the outward Supper* (and which

we think is undeniable) are not made an Article in that Confeſſion, and conſequently his Proof falls to the ground with his Aſſertion. But as to the *true Catholick Church, and the Communion of Saints*, we can readily ſubſcribe to the Article, and do truly own the *Communion of Saints* but deny it conſiſts in eating *outward Bread and drinking outward Wine*, while we ſuppoſe, the Bp. himſelf will not deny, that very *Wicked* and *Ungodly Men* have partaken of the *outward ſign*, whereas we ſay none can truly partake of the *Communion of Saints*, but thoſe who are truly ſuch, and which conſiſts in *Spiritual participation of the Body and Blood of Chriſt*, according to *John* 6. 35. 1 *Cor.* 10. 16. 2 *Cor.* 13. 14.

P. 20. The Bp's. next Inſtance is no more to the purpoſe then the laſt he tells us *in the Conſtantinopolitan Creed* (*compiled about the Year* 379. or 380. *when rebaptizing Hereticks had turmoiled the Church*) *'tis expreſt, I believe one Catholick Church, I acknowledge one Baptiſm for the remiſſion of Sins, that is* (ſays the Bp.) *perſons being once Baptized, and thereby ingrafted into the Church ought not to be Baptized again, which is the true ſenſe of one Baptiſm, and not what Mr. P. ſuggeſts.*

Anſw. The Bp. who ſo much faulted *W. P. p.* 14. for not citing Treatiſe or Page, doth as before take the ſame liberty again in

in this Citation. But ſuppoſe we ſhould allow what he hath here cited, [redacted], how will the acknowledging *one Baptiſm*, or the occaſion mentioned by the Bp. prove his point? he brought this for an Antient Creed, and as ſuch we might expect his proof, that Water Baptiſm and the Supper were made an Article therein; whereas there is no word of the Supper expreſſed, nor yet implied that we can perceive. In ſhort then this Inſtance falls with the firſt. Then as to his ſaying Perſons once Baptized, *&c. is the true ſence of the one Baptiſm and not what Mr.* P. *ſuggeſts.* Pleaſe, Reader, to view *W. P's. Defence, p.* 85, 86. and ſee whether what *W. P.* ſays be his own Suggeſtions: On the contrary *W. P.* cites *Epheſ.* 4. 5. One Lord, one Faith, one Baptiſm; which one Baptiſm he plainly proves by ſeveral Scripture Arguments, to be the one ſaving Baptiſm of Chriſt by the holy Ghoſt: The Bp. is out if he thinks his bare Aſſertion againſt *W. P.* will paſs for proof, while he is ſilent to all the Arguments advanced by *W. P.* The Bp. ſhould have remembred he told us, *p.* 18. that *Water Baptiſm without the New Creature or Baptiſm of the Spirit was not ſufficient to the Salvation of adult Perſons* (or words to the ſame effect) which beſpeak two Baptiſms, when the Apoſtle tells us *Eph.* 4. 5. but

of one Baptiſm, and if but one, that not in- [redacted] as Water is, but the ſaving Baptiſm of the Spirit as was plainly prov[redacted] *W. P.* This conſidered, how could the Bp. now affirm that Perſons once Baptized (*i.e.* with Water) is the true ſence of *one Baptiſm*, ſince himſelf confeſſeth Water Baptiſm is not ſufficient to Salvation, *&c.* We ſuppoſe he will hardly ſay, being once Baptized with Water produceth the Baptiſm of the Spirit, and ſo maketh the one Baptiſm, if not 'tis worth his Conſideration how to reconcile his Aſſertions in theſe two places with the Apoſtles one Baptiſm, *Epheſ.* 4. 5.

Now to the Bp's. third and laſt proof about the Antient Creeds, in which the Bp. Cites not only Treatiſe and Page but part of the Articles too, but omits the main part of all, namely the *Year*; we muſt tell the Bp. this will make no more to his purpoſe then the former proofs; for tho' we ſhould allow the Citations true, and that they are from the poor *Waldenſes* (whom *W. P.* commends for the good Qualifications he found in them,) Yet this Creed is too *late* to be accounted *antient*, as in the time of *Vladiſlaus* King of *Hungary*, *the firſt* King of that name, according to *Heylen's Coſmogr:* which was in the Year 1440. and the ſecond in 1491. but whether we are right in the time or not, yet 'tis ſo late that 'tis

rank

rank Popery to aſſert, as the Bp: has laid it down. viz. *No Man is ſaved who eats not the body of Chriſt, which body is not conſecrated but in the Church and by a Prieſt.* Again, *that none are ſaved unleſs Baptized, and that Infants are ſaved by Baptiſm.*

The Bp. was much in the right to queſtion what authority *W. P.* would allow the *Waldenſes* in this Creed, (ſuppoſing it theirs) To be ſure ſay we none; Nor will he allow it to be *antient* any more then thoſe made in the dark time of Popery, and therefore this proof alſo falls with the reſt; and if we ſhould ask the Bp. himſelf what authority he would allow the *Waldenſes* in this Creed, will he undertake to vindicate it from point blank Popery? we ſuppoſe nay.——As to what the Bp. ſaith of *Tradition*, and conſent of all Nations, that will come under conſideration in what follows.

Ibid. (20.) The Bp. frames an Argument upon thoſe two heads, viz. *Baptiſm* and the *Supper*, to prove us outwardly no Chriſtians, tho' in ſo doing he muſt bring himſelf under like circumſtances in a parallel caſe.

Ibid. (20.) *The Bp. ſays to renounce or caſt off the outward badges of the profeſſion of Chriſtianity, which our Lord Chriſt inſtituted, and his Apoſtles delivered, and which the Apoſtolical Churches received, and conſtantly*

practized, which all Christian Churches ever since has held to, is to renounce or to cast off the outward profession of Christianity, but Mr. P. *and his party renounce or cast off those outward badges of the profession of Christianity, which Christ Jesus appointed and his Apostles delivered, which the Apostolical Churches received, and constantly practized, which all Christian Churches have ever since held to, therefore Mr.* P. *and his party have renounced or cast off the outward profession of Christianity, that is outwardly are no Christians; as to their hearts the Bp. leaves them to God and judges not.*

Answ. The Bp. in this Argument takes that for granted which we do not own, namely that *outward Baptism* and the *Supper*, were to be continued down in the Churches, as *Institutions of Christ*, as also that they are the *outward badges* of the profession of Christianity, which we do not allow, the contrary having been proved by *W. P.* in his *Defence*, and others of our Friends who have writ on that subject: We observe altho' the Bp. continues to call them outward *Badges*, yet he omits to call them *Seals*, as he did in his *Testimony*, which to us seems to be the effect of *W. P's. Defence*, and with more reason it may be attributed thereto, then the effect attributed by the Bp. to his own *Paper* upon *W. P.* as before noted.

But

But to this faulty and long Argument, may not we by a parallel Argument make the Bp. and his party *outwardly no Chriſtians*, while they diſuſe other things no leſs (if not more) poſitively commandéd in holy Scripture: Thus our Lord Jeſus Chriſt the very ſame night he eat the Supper, *John* 13.4.to 15. roſe from Supper and with more Ceremony waſhed his Diſciples feet ſaying, *Verſ.* 14. *If I then your Lord and Maſter have waſhed your feet, ye ought alſo to waſh one anothers feet.* Verſ. 15. *For I have given you an Example, that ye ſhould do as I have done unto you.* This ſeems to us as plain a command for this practice, as that for *Bread and Wine*, and more plain then for *Water Baptiſm*, becauſe *Water* is not mentioned in the Commiſſion, (and this command we find was put in practice: See 1 *Tim.* 5. 10. and recommended as a virtue in a Widow) nor was this only an Example of *Humility* and *Love* (true *Badges* of *Chriſtianity*) but had a ſignification of an inward cleanſing as appears from the words of Chriſt upon *Peter's* refuſal, *John* 13. 8. *If I waſh thee not thou haſt no part in me.* Again, *Acts* 15.29. The Churches were expreſly commanded, as the mind of the *holy Ghoſt*, to abſtain from *blood and things ſtrangled.* Again the Believers were enjoined, *Jam.* 5. 14. that the ſick ſhould *be anointed with Oyle* in

the name of the Lord. Now from these instances, we form a parallel argument thus, To renounce, disuse, or cast off the *positive Institutions* and *Commands* which our *Lord Jesus Christ* and his *Apostles* delivered, and no doubt the primitive Christians in obedience thereunto *practized*, is to renounce and cast off the outward profession of Christianity; But the late Bp. of *Cork* and his party have renounced, cast off or disused the *washing of feet*, the *abstaining from blood and things strangled*, and the *anointing the Sick with Oyl in the name of the Lord*, which things our *Lord Jesus Christ* and his *Apostles instituted and commanded.*——Therefore the late *Bp. of Cork* and his party are *outwardly* no *Christians*, &c.

We take this to be a plain parallel argument and by which the Bp. and his party are as much unchristianed as he Renders the Quakers by his, while he can find no express repeal in Scripture for these things. ——And yet at the same time we neither believe, he or they for the disuse of these things, nor we for the other, ought or can be unchristian'd, for we believe they are all ceased alike. If the Bp. say, those were *temporary* things (with as good ground) we say the like of the other; If they say the repeal of *blood* and *things strangled* are implied, where the Apostle tells us *Coll.* 2. 16.

2, 16, we are not to *be judged in Meat or Drink*, &c. And that the Kingdom of God conſiſts not in *Meat and Drink*, Rom. 14. 17. We ſay the ſame of *outward Bread and Wine*, being *Meat and Drink*; In our argument, we have not included the conſtant practice of all Churches as the Bp. doth in his, becauſe we do not depend upon the verity of *Tradition*, (as the Bp. ſeems to do) altho' we underſtand that two of thoſe inſtances we have given, are ſtill practized after a manner by the Church of *Rome*, from whence we ſuppoſe, hee'l not deny he derives the continued practice of *Bread* and *Wine*, tho' he declines the other: But as to the practice of Chriſtian Churches (inſtanced by the Bp.) how greatly do they differ in their uſe as well as in their belief of the thing it ſelf, while there is none of all ſorts (nay not the Bp. himſelf) that follows the primitive practice, in the uſe of the *outward Supper*, as we have hinted before, and *W. P*'s. *Defence* hath more fully ſhewn; how then can we depend upon *tradition*? and thus we end about the *Supper*.

P. 21. *The laſt point of moment* (ſays the Bp.) *in Mr.* P's. *Book yet remaining untoucht, is the great Difference or ground of diſſent betwixt the Quakers and Eſtabliſht Church, and this Mr.* P. *tells us, is the great carnality and emptineſs both of Miniſters and People.* Upon which

which the Bp. in return upon the *Quakers* goes on thus.

Ibid. (21.)——*The Bp. hereby enforced ſpeak out, he ſays then that if eating the fat and drinking the choiceſt be carnallity.*—— *There is nothing to be eaten that is better then ordinary, that comes in to our markets here, which the People obſerve not preſently bought up by the Quakers, they are ſtill the earlieſt and beſt chapmen every Market day, for ſuch commodities, and much good may they do them.*—— And ſo concludes this as under the Title of *carnallity* and in the number of *Scandalous Inſtances.*

Anſw. If the Bp. in *ſpeaking out* had ſpoke more to the purpoſe we think he had come off with more credit, for certainly it is mean ſtuff for a Bp. to help to ſtuff his Book with all, and in an Inſtance too, that if there be *Scandal* in it perhaps he may be concerned beyond any *Quaker* in *Ireland*, (or for what we know in *England*) while 'tis believed his Table is ſupplied with *varieties* beyond any of theirs (tho' perhaps his eager purſute after the *Quakers* made him forget that part, or elſe thinks he ought to have a *diſpenſation* beyond them) But does the Bp. go to *Market* himſelf, or doth he write upon reports ? if upon report, doth it become him to write to the Defamation of any people upon bare report, which

which for ought he knows may be falſe, and we know is falſe as he ſtates it? for the *Quakers* of *Cork*, whom as we take it he means, by the word *here*, deny they are ſtill the *earlieſt Chapmen*; yet that ſome of them go with others at the common market time no doubt is true, and where is the *Scandal* or *Carnality* of it? if there be any the Bp. muſt be concerned in it, ſince (if it be true as we are informed) his *Caterer* has been obſerved to be generally one of the firſt there, tho' we will not ſay as the Bp. doth, *ſtill the earlieſt*, becauſe ſome extraordinary thing might occaſion his coming later then uſual, and by that means perhaps miſs a piece of meat for his Lord, (as he ſtiled him) which perhaps a *Quaker* (or ſome other) had bought before, which we will not ſay was the occaſion of this reflection, but probable enough it was ſo——Well, but the Bp. ſays we are the *beſt Chapmen*, and comes off with *much good may they do them.* Then ſay we to the firſt, the Butchers have no reaſon to complain of us, and to the laſt, what ever good he would have the meat do us 'tis plain he did not intend the ſtory in kindneſs, while he makes it a *Scandalous Inſtance.* Now as to our *eating* and *drinking*, we hope we do it in the *fear of God*, and in *moderation*, let the Bp. ſay what he will; and if the Bp's.

aptneſs

aptneſs to vilifie the *Quakers* had not been uppermoſt and moſt prevalent with him he might with a great deal more eaſe, have found thoſe nearer to him then the *Quakers*, who are guilty of great Exceſſes, as *riotous Feaſting*, *Drunkeneſs*, *Sporting*, *Games*, *Plays*, *Pride*, *Wantonneſs*, with many ſuch like things that appear (but too plain) to be *groſs carnality*, and which behoved the Bp. to ſee his own Flock more clear of, before he had brought this Inſtance to prove the *Quakers* guilty of *Carnality*.

We would have the Reader obſerve that the Bp. in this page. 21. (which we are now upon) had made a mixture of *Interwoven charges*, which we could not ſo regularly anſwer without bringing the parts of each charge together (which lay diſtant) as we did in the foregoing inſtance of *carnality*, ſo we do now in that of his Charging us with *worldlineſs*. Thus,

If minding worldly gain (ſays the Bp.) *and being ſo intent on it Day and Night; as to paſs moſt days in the week without a Prayer to God, either in publick Aſſembly or private Family; if the ſlieſt ways, both to get Money and to keep it be worldlineſs, he knows no ſort of People according to the degree of each given to thoſe vices more then the Quakers*; (and again at the end of that page goes on thus.) —*And indeed how they ſhould be a heavenly minded*

minded People who ſo much reſtrain Prayer, that is lay aſide, forbear or neglect it as to common practice, (at leaſt have done ſo) till of very late Years.

Anſw. If *charges* were *proofs* in theſe and other Inſtances, the Bp. had no doubt made us ſome of the worſt of People, but to be *reviled* and *abuſed* without cauſe has fallen to our lot, which we may not ſtrange at ſince it was the lot of the *Apoſtles* and *primitive Chriſtians* from the Men of that age, and more eſpecially from the *chief Prieſts*. Now as to that groſs and uncharitable reflection upon our getting Money, we have already ſpoken to it before, ſo it needs no farther anſwer here; But that we appeal to the *Searcher of Hearts*, who beſt knows whether we have preferred, or regarded *worldly things* above the *things of God.*

But as to *Prayer*, we ſay it is a falſe charge, that we ever did, either for *worldly gain*, or upon *any other account Reſtrain*, *Neglect*, or *lay aſide Prayer*, either of late Years or from the beginning. Indeed if the Bp. means the many *ſet forms of Prayer* made ready to our hands by Men, he's in the right, in ſaying we neglect them, (tho' not to get worldly gain) and hope we ſhall do ſo to the end, and we tell him, if ſuch *formal Prayers* would make Men better *Chriſtians*,

Chriſtians, and more acceptable to God, there is a Church that perhaps far exceeds his for multitude of *Prayers*, namely that of *Rome*. But as to the *Quakers*, they firmly believe no *Prayer* is acceptable to God unleſs performed by and through the aſſiſtance of his *holy Spirit*, which doth not only conſiſt in *Vocal* but *Mental Prayer*, according to *Rom.* 8. 26. *We know not what we ſhould Pray for, as we ought, but the Spirit it ſelf maketh interceſſion for us, with groanings which cannot be uttered.* Again 1 Cor. 14. 15. *I will Pray with the Spirit*, &c.——This ſort of *Prayer* we dearly own, and to Gods praiſe without boaſting we can ſay, we have had and ſtill have it frequently among us, not only in our *publick Meetings*, but alſo in *private Families*, both *Vocally* and *Internally*, and not only ſo, but we are taught by the help of the *Spirit* to *Pray in Spirit every where*, according to 1 *Tim.* 2. 8. as well in our Buſineſs and Callings as in our publick Aſſemblies.

Ibid. (21.) The Bp. ſays *he could mention more Scandalous Particulars or Inſtances, both of carnality and worldlineſs among them, but it is not agreable to his Temper.* For a Man to ſay the worſt he can, (which we ſuppoſe the Bp. has done, and more than is true, and then pretends he could ſay more, is, we think, a *Sly* way of *ſlander* and beſpeaks no good *temper*. Again,

Again, (the Bp. *p.* 22.) *Let Mr.* P. *then know, whatſoever Mens attainments may be, its not good ſo much to boaſt of their being Spiritual.*

Anſw. God he knows we *boaſt* not, (nor have we any thing whereof to *boaſt*) as of our ſelves, but may we not without *boaſting* as *David* did, *Pſal.* 66. 16. *Tell others what God hath done for our Souls.* And having by good experience witneſſed the good and bleſſed effects of the *Light*, *Grace* and *Spirit* of God upon our *Souls*; ſhall we not in the love of God call and invite others thereunto? ſurely we may, and if for theſe things we are accounted *boaſters*, we muſt and ſhall be content to bear this reproach with the reſt.

Ibid. (22.) *To ſpeak*, ſays the Bp. *to the true Notion of Spirituality, ſuch Spiritual Perſons as Mr.* P. *pretends to be, and as the Apoſtle ſpeaks of,* 1 *Cor.* 11. (but we ſupoſe he intended) 1 *Cor.* 2. *the place ſo much inſiſted, on by Mr.* P. *and ever and anon alluded to by him and his followers: Neither Mr.* P. *is, nor any Perſon that we know now living; Namely they can none of them Preach in demonſtration of the Spirit and Power.* Verſ. 4. *They have not* (ſays the Bp.) *thoſe extraordinary Gifts of the Spirit to ſpeak with tongues, and Propheſie, heal the Diſeaſed*; And ſo the Bp. goes on to other miraculous Gifts

and

and Revelations of the Spirit, which the Apoſtles had.——And in *p.* 23. adds, *this kind of Spiritual Men are ceaſed.*

Anſw. It would take up much time and Paper to be ſo large upon theſe Objections of the Bp's. as we could be, to ſhew how that through the coming in of the Apoſtacy Men became *outſide* and *nominal Chriſtians*, by forſaking and neglecting the inward guidance of the *Grace and Spirit of God*, and inſtead thereof ſet up *outward Forms*, and *Preſcriptions* of Men: But we ſhall be brief, and only add this, that God in his infinite goodneſs is bringing his Church out of the Wilderneſs, and from the *teachings of Man*, to the *teachings of his good Spirit.* But to proceed.

Firſt. As to ſuch extraordinary and Miraculous Gifts of the Spirit, as of *healing the Diſeaſed*, and *ſpeaking with tongues* which the Apoſtles had, we ſhall at preſent only return the Bp. the ſame anſwer, which the firſt *Proteſtants* uſually gave the *Papiſts*, who demanded a confirmation of their *New* Doctrine (as they termed it) by *Miracles*; to which the *Proteſtants* replied that they Preached no *New Goſpel*, but the ſame which was confirmed before by Miracles, and therefore needed no new ones to confirm it; and alſo that *John the Baptiſt* with many of the *Prophets*, tho' immediately and extraordi-

traordinarily called, yet did no *Miracles* that we read of; and the ſame anſwer may ſerve for us, while we have always been ready to confirm our Doctrine by holy Scripture: but altho' ſuch extraordinary Gifts of Tongues, &c. are ceaſed, yet it doth not therefore follow, we ought to neglect the inward teachings and dictates of the *holy Spirit of God*, which is given to Chriſtians, as a ſtanding perpetual rule, and more immediate guide under the *New Covenant* to walk by, and without which they cannot rightly perform their duty to God, as we have ſhewn before. (*p.* [illegible]) As to that Text, 1 *Cor.* 13. 8. brought by the Bp. 'Tis plain thoſe Gifts there mentioned were to ceaſe, by giving way to what was more excellent, more perfect; ſee *v.* 10. 11, 12. following [illegible] and not by being ſucceeded by what is more *carnal*, and deſtitute of the *Spirit*; but leaving this at preſent we ſhall attend the Bp's. Objection, which relates to the Miniſtry, viz. *that none can now Preach in the Demonſtration of the Spirit and power.*

To which we anſwer, If that were ſo, then none can preach as the *Oracles of God*, nor in preaching be beneficial to the People, ſince the holy Scripture tells us, that the *Spirit* is a neceſſary and eſſential qualification to conſtitute a *Miniſter of Chriſt* which

we ſhall prove, (1ſt.) from *Jeſus Chriſt* himſelf, when he gave the Apoſtles that commiſſion *Matt.* 28. 19. to Preach, he tells them thus, Verſ. 20. *Teaching them to obſerve all things, whatſoever I have commanded you, and lo I am with you alway, even to the end of the World.* We hope none will be ſo trifling as to ſay, this Command extended only to the Apoſtles, if any ſo weak (to think ſo) then the foregoing *Verſ.* 19. about *Baptizing* (which they ſuppoſe Water) muſt likewiſe extend no farther; but ſuppoſing none ſo weak, thus to object, yet ſome may Query how was Chriſt to be with his Miniſters to the *end of the world?* Was it not by the holy Scripture, the outward means now left to Chriſtians? To this we anſwer, 'twas by his *Spirit*, which we prove from Chriſt's own words, *John* 14. 16. *I will pray the Father and he ſhall give you another comforter, that he may abide with you for ever.* Verſ. 17. *Even the Spirit of truth, he dwelleth with you and ſhall be in you.* Ver. 26. *The comforter, the holy Ghoſt he ſhall teach you all things* (ſaith Chriſt) *John* 15. 5. *Without me* (ſaith Chriſt) *ye can do nothing:* from theſe with more Texts of Scripture, 'tis plain that Chriſt by his *Spirit* was to be with his truly conſtituted Miniſters to the end of the World, by whom they were taught all things, and without whom

whom they could do nothing, and pursuant to that commission and promise of *Christ*, the Apostles were called, commissionated, and did Preach by the *Spirit*, according to 2 *Cor.* 3. 6. *Gall.* 1. 11, 12. 1 *Cor.* 2. 4. and we do not find the Apostles did confine the *Spirit* to themselves only, but did recommend the same Gift of the *Spirit* as the necessary qualification to the constituting a *Minister of the Gospel.* (thus) 1 *Peter* 4. 10, 11. *As every Man hath received the Gift, even so minister the same one to another as good stewards of the manifold Grace of God. If any Man speak let him speak as the Oracles of God;* If any *Man minister, let him do it as of the ability which God giveth, that God in all things may be Glorified.* Which we take to be as much as if he had said none ought to speak or minister about the things of God, but by the Gift of his *holy Spirit*, and who ever doth not so speak or minister cannot in so doing do it to the *Glory of God.* We could cite more Scriptures to the same purpose, which for brevity sake we omit: these may suffice to shew that whoever pretends to be a *Minister of Christ*, cannot be truly such without the Qualification of and being Commissionated by the *holy Ghost*: And as to the Bp's. saying, *that* W. P. *nor none can now Preach in demonstration of the Spirit and Power*, 'tis but his bare assertion, and more

then he can prove.——But as to the Bp's. part, we may be ſure he cannot ſo Preach ſince he denies it to all, and while he thus aſſerts, he will do well to conſider, how he came by his Miniſtry, ſince Chriſt promiſed to be with his Miniſters to the end of the World, and that his *Spirit* was to continue with and in them for ever; from which Gift of his *Spirit*, they were to ſpeak (according to the Apoſtle) as the *Oracles of God*, which to be ſure cannot be but *in demonſtration of the Spirit and Power.*—— Having thus Proved the *Spirit* to be a neceſſary Qualification to the conſtituting a Miniſter of Chriſt, we now come to conſider the Bp's. *outward way* to *Holyneſs* and *Spirituallity*, in which we ſhall find him as much out of the way as in the laſt. The Bp. Proceeds.

P. (23.) *People are now made holy by the uſe of outward means and grow up in Grace by degrees, yet in both caſes, as to Gifts as well as Holineſs, there are thoſe, who by Analogy and Proportion, may ſtill be termed Spiritual, that is, there are perſons, who by ſtudy and induſtry attain to ſpeak with tongues*, &c. *Others who having from the holy Scriptures, which were indited by the Spirit of God, learnt the mind of the Spirit, and being in their hearts perſwaded of the Truths and Duties they have thence learnt, and felt their Soul ſtrongly*

ſtrongly moved by the Power of the Spirit under the Miniſtry of the Word, to the performance of ſuch Duties, have yielded themſelves and ſubmitted to the Conduct of the holy Ghoſt leading them by Scripture into all truth, as well as Holineſs. Thus, Reader, we have given thee this long Citation of the Bp's. that his own words may fully ſpeak his mind.

Anſw. The Bp. hath here aſſerted upon his own authority and without proof, that *People are now made holy by the uſe of outward means*, and that *there are thoſe, who by Study and induſtry attain to ſpeak with tongues, may be termed Spiritual*: But contrary hereunto the holy Scriptures do abundantly prove, *viz.* That People are *made holy* and *Spiritual* by *inward means*, as we ſhall plainly ſhew, only before we proceed we will here again give the *holy Scriptures* their due place, and allow them to be whatſoever they ſay of themſelves, according to theſe or any other Texts, *Rom.* 15, 4. 2 *Tim.* 3. 15, 16, 17. believing them to be the beſt Writings extant in the World, and we love honour and eſteem them beyond all others, and are ſo far from laying them aſide as uſeleſs, that we ſay they are inſtrumental, a furtherance and help to Believers in the work of the Lord; but then we ſay 'tis through Faith which is the fruit of the

Spirit, *Gal.* 5. 22. And thus they furniſhed the Man of *God*, 2 *Tim.* 3. 17. for ſo he was to be, that received thoſe benefits by them; and we are ſo far from excluding the *holy Scriptures* from being helpful and beneficial to us, that we exclude not other outward and inſtrumental means, as *Preaching*, &c. But ſtill we ſay it is by the Gift of the *holy Spirit*, by the illumination of which (and as the foundation) all outward means become beneficial and ſerviceable to us; and thus, *Acts* 16. 14.---*Lydia* ---*Whoſe heart the Lord opened that ſhe attended unto the things which were ſpoken by Paul.* Here 'twas the Lord opened the heart of *Lydia*, by which means as the efficient cauſe *Paul's* preaching became effectual to her; thus much briefly as to the *holy Scriptures*. Now to the Bp's. words before Cited, wherein he has aſſerted, *that People are now made holy by the uſe of outward means*, and from the *Scriptures learnt the mind of the Spirit*. Whereas we ſay the principal agent and by which People are made holy, is the *Grace and Spirit of God*, which we now come to prove by Scripture. Thus, 1 *John* 2. 27. *But the anointing ye have received, abideth in you, and ye need not that any Man teach you, but as the ſame anointing teacheth you of all things*, *Rom.* 1. 19. *But that which may be known of God is manifeſt*

feſt in them, for God hath ſhewed it unto them. Again, 2 Cor. 4. 6, 7. 1 Cor. 2. 12. 1 Cor. 6. 19. Rom. 8. 9. And wicked Men alſo hath this Gift and means in themſelves, tho' they will not make uſe of it nor regard it: Thus the Slothful Servant, *Matt.* 25. 18. had a Talent tho' he made no uſe of it, and the *Phariſees*, the worſt of *Chriſts* enemies, Luk. 17. 21. *had the Kingdom of Heaven within them.* Thus having ſhewn (by a few of the many Texts we could produce) *the means to be inward*; we now come to prove People are *made holy* by this *inward means*, viz. the Gift of the *holy Spirit.*——Rom. 8. 13. *If ye through the Spirit do mortifie the deeds of the Body, ye ſhall live; but if ye live after the Fleſh ye ſhall die,* 1 Cor. 6. 9, 10, 11. *Know ye not that the unrighteous ſhall not inherit the Kingdom of God.*----*Neither Fornicators, Idolators, Adulterors,*---*Thieves, Covetous, Drunkards, Revilers, Extortioners,*----*and ſuch were ſome of you, but ye are waſhed, Sanctified, Juſtified in the name of our Lord Jeſus and by the Spirit of our God,* Eph. 4. 7. *Unto every one is given Grace, according to the meaſure of the Gift of Chriſt*; Titus 2. 11. *The Grace of God that bringeth Salvation hath appeared unto all Men, teaching us that denying ungodlineſs and Worldly Luſts we ſhould live ſoberly, righteouſly, and godlily in this preſent World.*

Eph. 5. 9, 10. *The fruit of the Spirit is all Goodneſs, Righteouſneſs, and Truth.* Again *John* 16. 13. *the Spirit was to guide into all truth*; then the Children of God were to be led *by his Spirit*, and none were his, but ſuch as was guided thereby, *Rom.* 8. 9, 14. In ſhort 'tis needleſs to bring more of the numerous Scripture Teſtimonies which might be cited to prove this point, but theſe may ſuffice to ſhew that People are *made holy* by the *Grace* and *Spirit of God within Men* and not by *outward means*, as the Bp. hath aſſerted, and the ſame way they are made *holy*, they are likewiſe made *Spiritual*, it being impoſſible to be a *holy Man* without being *Spiritual*, ſee *Rom.* 8. 6. *To be Spiritually minded is life and peace.*——And the way whereby Men become *Spiritual* is by the *Spirit of God* according to 1 *Cor.* 2. 10. to 15. But contrary hereunto the Bp tells us, *There are thoſe who by Analogy and Proportion may be ſtill termed Spiritual*; *that is there are perſons who by ſtudy and induſtry attain to ſpeak with tongues*, &c. We ask then, whether wicked Men who have attained to ſpeak with tongues, are not of the number of the *B'ps. Spiritual Men*? and whether his definition of *Spiritual Men* is not ſuch as *natural Men* may attain unto? As to the Bp's. telling us of the *power of the Spirit*, and again, *the conduct of the holy Ghoſt*

Ghoſt leading them by Scripture into all Truth, as well as holineſs, He muſt not be diſpleaſed if we tell him, that we know no ſuch language in holy Scripture, as leading by *Scripture into all Truth:* On the contrary, the Scriptures themſelves do aſcribe Holineſs and Truth to the *Spirit* directly, as we have ſhewn, to which purpoſe, we'l add one Text here, *John* 16. 13. *when he,* (the *Spirit of Truth*) *is come he will guide you into all Truth*; but upon what ground or with what reaſon can the Bp. ſpeak of the *Spirit* and the *holy Ghoſt*? when he firſt told us, *People are now made holy by the uſe of outward means*, And *from the Scriptures have learnt the mind of the Spirit*, whereas the work of the *Spirit* is *within*, as we have already proved.' If he ſhall retract, and tell us, as the holy Scripture doth, that People are led into all *Truth* and Holineſs by the *Spirit*, we ſhall then agree in that point.

Ibid. (23.) The Bp. goes on, telling us the ſeveral effects producible in his way of Spirituality and Holineſs, and *p.* 24. ſays thus, "*Let ſuch Perſons as theſe be allowed to be Spiritual; and if ſo, the Bp. ſays he doubts not but there will be found more ſuch who are no Quakers, then who really are; and particularly the Bp. claims to be ſuch an one himſelf, and challenges Mr.* P. *to prove the Contrary.*

Anſw.

Anſw. We will not differ with him about the numbers of his ſort of Spiritually made Men, and that they do exceed the *Quakers*, believing it true; But we have already proved the *Bp's. outward way*, and the *Scriptures inward way* to Holineſs and Spirituallity do widely differ, and as they ſo do, the effects in reallity muſt do the ſame, and therefore we ſhall be very brief with the Bp. as to his challenge, and tell him, tho' we allow him alſo to be a *Spiritual Man*, according to his *outward way* of making them, yet *W. P.* nor we need not goe about to prove that he is no *Spiritual Man*, according to *Scripture Definition*, ſince he has ſo effectually done it himſelf. Thus much as to *Spirituality* and *Holineſs*.

Ibid (24.) The Bp. proceeds, *as to emptineſs the Bp. craves pardon if he be at a loſs what Mr.* P. *means thereby.*

Anſw. Why the Bp. at a loſs, ſince *W. P.* ſpoke ſo very plain as to the emptineſs of the Clergy, while in *p.* 107, 108. he tells him 'tis *preaching without the Spirit in a lifeleſs and humane miniſtry*, and ſuch as were made *Miniſters by humane Learning and Authority*, whereas the Miniſters of Chriſt became ſuch by the Qualifications an *Gifts* of the *Spirit*, as he had proved, and which is further confirmed by us.

Ibid.

Ibid. (24.) *If emptineſs* (ſays the Bp.) *ſignifies the Miniſters Sermons being barren, with little ſubſtance or ſolid matter in them, the Quakers are much more guilty, as far as ever the Bp's experience could reach; witneſs the firſt things they publiſhed, if compared to the Printed Sermons of the conformable Clergy, ſince Mr.* P's. *acceſſion to them, it muſt be confeſt, he has much improved them, and brought them to write what looks like ſenſe and Coherence.*

Anſw. We cannot wonder the Bp. ſhould ſpeak in the behalf of that Clergy being one of the number himſelf, and againſt the *Quakers*, whom he hath endeavoured to reproach, and therefore, to be ſure, no competent Judg of either our Preaching or Writings, for which reaſon we ſhall appeal from him to more competent and impartial Judges, in relation to both; but this we will ſay, that altho' the *Quakers* were never *againſt*, but *for* true ſenſe and coherence in Preaching and Writing, yet we lay no ſuch ſtreſs or neceſſity upon the *Learning*, *Arts*, *Parts*, and *Wiſdom* of *Men* in doing either, as perhaps the Bp. doth; and he may remember the greateſt Truths, namely the holy Scriptures, are delivered in a Style ſuted to the meaneſt capacities. Again that Learned Apoſtle *Paul* was ſo far from recommending the Learning and wiſdom of Men,

Men, and excellency of Speech in preaching, &c. that he both oppoſes as well as diſeſteems and undervalues them from being either a means or furtherance to the work of the Lord. On the Contrary he exalts the *weak, fooliſh and deſpiſed things of the World as more acceptable to God*, ſee 1 *Cor.* 1. 17. to 29. and has this ſame up again, *Chap.* 2. 13. thus, *Which things we alſo ſpeak not in the words which Mans wiſdom teacheth. But which the holy Ghoſt teacheth, comparing Spiritual things with Spiritual.* Here the Apoſtle point blank oppoſes Spirituallity, and the teachings of the holy Ghoſt, to the wiſdom and teachings of Men, contrary whereunto (as we have before obſerved) the Bp. hath aſſerted, that Men may ſtill be termed *Spiritual* by *outward Study* and *Learning*.

But as to the *Quakers*, they are of the ſame mind with the Apoſtle, and are ſo far from valuing the moſt excellent Preaching proceeding from the *Arts, Parts, Wiſdom*, and *Learning* of *this World* without the *Spirits Teaching*, that they prefer far above and beyond it, a few plain mean words either from Man or Woman, as proceeding from the Motion of the *Divine Spirit*, and altho ſuch ſpeech or words may ſeem very contemptible in the eyes of the wiſe and learned Men of this World, in their *natural State*, yet

yet ſuch Preaching carries an evidence with it to the *enlightned underſtanding*, far excelling the other, not only to illiterate perſons but to ſuch alſo, who have had the Arts and Literature of this World, whoſe underſtandings have been opened by the *Divine Spirit.*——And as to *W. P.* tho' we eſteem and Love him yet 'tis not barely either for his *Parts* or *Learning*, but for his *Chriſtian ſincerity towards God and his Truth.*

Again the Bp. (*p.* 24.) *But the Bp. would willingly know of Mr.* P. *what there was in* B. Wheddons *holding Forth.*——*after Mr.* P. *at* Cork *when he put his hat before his face and laughed, and whether ſhe be the only perſon from whom in their Aſſemblies he has often heard ſuch ſtuff.*

Anſw. In this ſtory as well as other things, relating perſonally to *W. P.* the Bp. took care to let *W P.* be gone out of *Europe* before he publiſhed his *Book*: we ſuppoſe the Bp. don't pretend to give this ſtory from his own knowledg, how well then doth it becom the Bp. to write ſuch ſtories upon report, and is not that word *holding Forth* uſed in deriſion or ſcorn? but what *ſtuff?* why did not the Bp. tell us the *ſtuff?* if he knew, and if he did not, he might with more credit have been ſilent to the ſtory, while in thus doing he only demonſtrates his willing mind to bring any ſtory (tho'

it

it be a lame one) in hopes to vilifie the *Quakers*. But as to the ſtory of *W.* P's. *laughing* 'tis as improbable as frivolous, and which we no more believe, then that the late *Bp. of Cork* is now in *China*. (1*ſt*.) becauſe *W. P.* is a Man of a ſolid carriage and grave Deportment, and in his common converſation ſeldom if ever given to *laughter*, and not very often to *ſmile*.——But that he ſhould *laugh* at what was ſpoken in a meeting by a Woman of his own communion, and in a place too, where perhaps there were many ſcores if not hundreds of Auditors beſides Quakers.

We ſay that he ſhould laugh under all thoſe circumſtances is ſo ridiculouſly improbable, that we ſhould think none will believe it, but ſuch as will not disbelieve any ſtory what ever againſt the *Quakers*. (2*ly*.) We let the Bp. know whatever the Cuſtom of *laughing* be *in his congregation* we have no ſuch in *ours* ; and whoſoever the Bp's. Spie or Informer was, we ſuppoſe him one who uſed to laugh in his own Church or elſe (to be ſure) he would not have imagined *W. P.* to laugh in our Meeting. But that *W. P.* might pull his hat before his eyes (while ſhe was ſpeaking) may be probable, it being very uſual for him ſo to do in our Meetings, which perhaps this Informer obſerving, might imagin he laughed, while

while it was only the effects of a ſtrong prepoſſeſſion of mind, as knowing it was common to laugh in his own Church; this is the moſt charitable conſtruction we can put upon that improbable ſtory: But if this were not the caſe, we then conclude it to be a wilful forgery to make a ſtory to the Bp. whom the Informer might know was ready enough to receive one againſt *him* and the *Quakers*.

Ibid. (25.) And part of 26. is about the maintainance for the Miniſtry; and indeed we find *W. P.* touched a tender place, while he treated upon this head, which is apparent by the Bp's. being greatly diſpleaſed, if we may conclude reviling and abuſing *W. P.* be an indication thereof. *viz. p.* 25. ſaith the Bp. *A Man will be ſtrongly tempted to an unlucky gueſs where that perſon* (meaning *W. P.*) *has taken in his Principles* (alluding as we take it to Popery.) Again, the Bp. *p.* 26. *If Mr.* P. *be not popiſhly affected, which hath been long feared of him, and that on very likely grounds, it may be ſuſpected hence that he has a greater kindneſs for Atheiſm then is conſiſtant with his profeſſion.*

Anſw. The Bp's. fear and Suſpition that *W. P.* is either *popiſhly* or *Atheiſticaly* affected proceeds from the ſame ground, and are alike true, as that he died a Papiſt about ſixteen years ago in *Penſilvania*, and this was

was put in Print too by ſome of his Enemies: But we muſt tell the Bp. *W. P's.* Credit in thoſe two points are above the reach of his Cenſorious pen, not only with the *Quakers*, but with many Men of note and Character in the World even of the *Bp's. own Church.* Well, but why muſt *W. P.* be affected to *Popery* or have a kindneſs for *Atheiſm* with the Bp? why? 'tis becauſe he is for *a free Goſpel Miniſtry*, and obſerves the *Miniſtry is become too much a temporal preferment, and few to be found among them, who court not ſtations of greateſt profit and Honour*; ſee *W. P's. Defence* 109. which indeed falls ſo very pat, and touches the Bp. ſo to the Quick (upon his late *remove*) (tho' no doubt was then unknown to *W. P.*) that 'tis not ſo much to be wondered at, why he ſhould be ſo uneaſie under it. But had the Bp. rightly conſidered, he could not have ſuppoſed that *W. P's.* diſlike of *Tythes* or other forced Maintainance proceeded from his being *popiſhly* affected, becauſe *Tythes* as a ſettled maintainance were introduced in time of *Popery.*

Ibid. (25.) The Bp. tells us, meaning *W. P. would have ſo great a body as the Miniſtry in theſe Kingdoms all become ſomewhat like mendicant Friers. No Rents or Dues muſt be allowed them, but Alms and Gifts,*

with

what then (says the Bp.) *are they likely to be more sincere in their Doctrine by being put to please Men that they may give them Alms.*

Answ. No, *W. P.* nor the *Quakers* would not have the Ministry Beggers, nor yet somewhat like *Mendicant Friers*, their begging way being nothing like the Apostles way of maintainance, and yet we would have such as have occasion, to be satisfied with *Christ's free allowance*, which was no other then free Gifts, and from the hands of such too, as did receive them and their ministry; see *Matt.* 10. 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15. And this maintainance we find the Apostles excepted of, and were satisfied with, tho' it seems so far from pleasing the Bp. that he makes it a temptation to please Men: Surely we hope the Bp. will allow, that *our Lord* knew better then he, and that his command and way of a free maintainance, was not what would lead his Ministers into a temptation to be Men-pleasers, and we think it was not reverent, and what became a Bp. to draw such a consequence, whereby he implicitely reflected on the *Christian Lawgiver*, tho' intended directly against *W. P.* and the *Quakers.*

Again, Ibid. 25. Says the Bp. *miraculous supports are ceased with Miracles themselves.* What miraculous supports? we find none

required, they (viz. the Apoſtles) were manifeſt to Mens Conſciences, (is that ceaſed now?) and received what was ſet before them, and from thoſe who would not receive them, nor their doctrine, they departed, and ſhook off the duſt of their feet.

The Bp. tells us *Ibid.* 25. *Mr. P. no where moves, that thoſe laws which forbid Miniſters to exerciſe Merchandizing, Mechanicks or Secular Employments, may be abrogated or taken away.*

We ask whether thoſe Laws are *Civil* or *Canon*? and upon what occaſion theſe Laws were made? and whether it was not becauſe of the *great covetouſneſs* of the Clergy, who not being content with the exceſſive gain of *Tythes*, were ſo greedy of gain, that they would be getting other ways too? (and perhaps by *wily* and *ſly* ways as the Bp. ſlanders the *Quakers*.) We farther ask the Bp. if *W. P.* or the *Quakers* ſhould move, as he ſpeaks, will he promiſe for himſelf and engage or endeavour with the reſt of the Clergy, they will be content without Tythes, provided thoſe Laws be Repealed, when we know his mind he may hear farther; in the mean time, without he had let us know his mind in that caſe, we think his Objection was to little purpoſe. But ſays the Bp.

Ibid.

Ibid. (25.) *If Lands and Tythes be denied them, and they are forbid other ways of getting a livelihood, there remains nothing but going a begging.*

Anſw. If they are Miniſters of Chriſt and ſent by him, there is no danger of that, for *David* under the Law, *Pſa.* 37. 25. *Saw not the righteous forſaken nor his Seed begging Bread:* And *Chriſt* exhorts his Diſciples to truſt providence for Clothing, Meat, and Drink, *&c.* ſee *Matt.* 6. 31, 32, 33. and tells them *Chap.* 10. 29, 30. as an encouragement to depend upon God's providence, that the very *hairs of their heads were numbred*, and not a *Sparrow* fell to the ground without God: And again promiſed to be with his Miniſters to the end of the World, *Matt.* 28. 20. And ſhall the Miniſters of Chriſt in our day diſtruſt his providence for ſuch neceſſaries as they ſtand in need of? ſurely no. They have faith in him that he will open the hearts of ſome to adminiſter to their neceſſities, and will not fear their going a begging, tho' they have no *Tythes*. But we confeſs it may be otherwiſe with thoſe who are made Miniſters by outward means, as by *Man* and *Money*, and indeed it's no wonder if ſuch want the true faith, which is inward and the *fruit of the Spirit*, *Gall.* 5. 22. The Bp's. chief and indeed the only Scripture argument he has

brought *in ſpight* (as he ſays) *of all ſuch, ill conſequences*, to prove their maintainance to be *jure divino* is 1 *Cor.* 9. 13, 14. where proviſion is made for thoſe who wait at the *Altar*, &c.——*And they who preach the Goſpel ſhould live of the Goſpel.*

Anſw. (1*ſt.*) This Scripture, tho' the chief the Bp. could bring, will make very little for his purpoſe to prove *Tythes* and other *forced maintainance*, due under the Goſpel diſpenſation, which was the point the Bp. ought to prove if he could, and which to be ſure he never can do by Scripture.

(2*ly.*) The Quakers never denied or diſallowed ſuch a living as we are to underſtand *Paul* doth here mean, to wit the Miniſters of *Chriſt* who preached the Goſpel ſhould be ſupplied with ſuch neceſſaries of Food and Raiment as they ſtood in need of; but as then ſo now, it's to come *free* and *voluntary* and from the hands of ſuch too who had partaken of their miniſtry, or believed them to be Miniſters of Chriſt, and to this agrees *Rom.* 15. 27. *If the Gentiles have been partakers of their Spiritual things their duty is alſo to miniſter unto them in carnal things.*

(3*ly.*) This ſort of living and this way of maintainance for Miniſters of Chriſt (who ſtand in need of and want neceſſaries)

we

we are for, and with which agrees the very command of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt when he ſent forth his Diſciples, *Matt.* 10. 8, 9. *freely ye have received, freely give*; But at the ſame time bids them neither *provide Gold, Silver, or Braſs in their purſes, neither two coats, nor ſhoes*, and gives the reaſon againſt ſuch proviſion. *Verſ.* 10. *for the workman is worthy of his meat*; as much as to ſay, tho' you are to preach freely, as neither to command or demand any thing for Preaching, yet you may receive ſuch neceſſaries as you want or ſtand in need of. Now who are they to receive this from, but from ſuch who received them, for he bids them ſhake off the *duſt of their feet*, as a teſtimony againſt ſuch who would neither *receive them, nor hear their words.* Verſ. 14.

(4*ly.*) Beyond the extent of Chriſt's allowance and the perſons from whom to receive, we are not to underſtand that Text, 1 *Cor.* 9. 14. nor indeed are we to underſtand it otherwiſe from the context it ſelf, (1*ſt.*) Becauſe 'twas to the Believers he then wrote, therefore from the *Believers* only the Miniſters of Chriſt were to take what was given. (2*ly.*) That *Paul* was far from intending a great and *lordly allowance* or living; hear what he ſaith, *Verſ.* 18. What is *my reward then* (ſays he) *verily that when I preach the Goſpel, I may make*

the Goſpel of Chriſt without charge, that I abuſe not my power in the Goſpel. From whence two things are obſerveable. (*1ſt.*) That he makes it rewardable to preach without charge, conſequently then the more chargeable the leſs rewardable. (*2ly.*) That there was a danger of abuſing the Goſpel Power (which muſt be only underſtood in taking neceſſaries according to Chriſts allowance,) therefore being ſo nice a point, and having regard to his reward, and fearing he might abuſe his power, he choſe rather to work with his own hands, then take any thing at all, which he did to the ſupply of his own, and the neceſſities of them that were with him, in which he became a good pattern and Example to others.

Thus he tells the Church of *Epheſus*, *Acts* 20. 33, 34, 35. *I have coveted no Mans Silver, Gold, or Apparell, theſe hands have adminiſtered unto my neceſſities, and to them that were with me:* we think it can remain no longer a doubt, what ſort of living and maintainance *Paul* allowed the Miniſtry, by 1 *Cor.* 9. 14. viz. to receive at the hands of Believers for to anſwer their neceſſities.

(*5ly.*) Now, Impartial Reader, compare the Goſpel allowance from Chriſt Jeſus our Lord and what we are to underſtand from *Paul*, 1 *Cor.* 9. 13, 14. (the place cited

cited by the Bp.) and ſee what proportion or equality it holds with *Tythes* and other *forced maintainance* in our day, and whether they, who pretend to be Miniſters of Chriſt, and get ſo many hundreds, if not ſome of them ſome thouſands by the Year for preaching, do not unreaſonably exceed as well as abuſe the Goſpel power and maintainance which Paul *allowed* the miniſtry.

Ibid. (25.) The Bp. proceeds thus, *The Bp. doubts not to affirm, that take away the Eſtabliſhed Miniſtry (which in moral ſpeaking cannot ſubſiſt without a maintainance) and let our Pariſh Churches be left deſtitute of learned Preachers, and not only Popery in ſome places, but Irreligion and Barbarity more generally would ſoon enſue.*

Anſw. The firſt part of the Bp's. words are not hard to be underſtood, and are as plain, as we believe them true, which we take to be that if the Miniſters ſettled Maintainance be taken away, the Miniſtry will fall *and the Churches be left deſtitute of them.*—— Then ſay we if *maintainance* uphold and ſupports them we think it's plain that *maintainance* is their *foundation*, ſince they fall without it: We ask then whoſe Miniſters they are? ſince *Chriſt Jeſus* was the *foundation* of his truly conſtituted Miniſters, with whom he promiſed to be to the end of the World, *Matt.* 28. 20. and upon whom

a neceſſity was laid to preach the Goſpel, and who were ſo far from forbearing to preach for want of a *ſettled maintainance*, that *cruel Sufferings*, as *Whipping*, *Stoning*, *Impriſonment*, nay *death it ſelf* could not deter or hinder them therefrom, the hands of theſe we find adminiſtred to their neceſſities, whereas the Bp's. miniſtry, morally ſpeaking (as he tells us) cannot ſubſiſt, and that the Churches will be left deſtitute of them in caſe they are not upheld by ſettled maintainance: We could ſay much more upon this head, but forbear and refer, to the Impartial Reader upon a ſerious conſideration, whether ſuch be true *Goſpel Miniſters*, as the Bp. has ſtated them, or Miniſters for *Money* and *maintainance*.

As to the Bp's. conſequence that *Popery* and *Barbarity would enſue*, in caſe *the Eſtabliſht Miniſtry were taken away*, (by forbearing of the maintainance.)

We anſwer the conſequence is not true; for when the Clergy's maintainance was greater in theſe Nations, before Impropriations were taken from them, there was more *Popery*, *Irreligion*, and *Barbarity* then now, and perhaps would be leſs if *Tythes* were wholly down, and all preachers left to a free maintainance. Now as to *Popery*, there would be little danger of that, becauſe if the *Papiſts* were ſure before hand to miſs of the

the ſweet gain of *Tythes*, &c. they would no more trouble the Churches or People then the Bp's. Miniſtry, ſince they never fail, wherever they get footing to promote *Tythes*, and are as much for upholding them, as the Bp. or his Miniſtry can be; conſequently then the Churches would be as deſtitute of them as of the Bp's. Miniſtry, and therefore no danger of Popery. Next as to *Irreligion and Barbarity ſoon enſuing.*

Anſw. There would be as little danger thence, as of *Popery*, *ſince* inſtead of *Men made Miniſters*, and ſuch whoſe prop and foundation is *Tythes* and *forced maintainance*, we might not doubt the good providence of God in ſending us Miniſters of *his own making*, who would preach *freely* as they had received the ſame, and in ſo doing would come with leſs ſuſpition of worldly and ſiniſter ends; while gain and advantage was no motive to their undertaking of that Office and the effects of ſuch miniſters preaching as theſe, no doubt would be far from introducing *Popery*, *Barbarity*, or *Irreligion*, that in all probability People would generally and ſooner become better Chriſtians under ſuch a Miniſtry, then they now are under the Eſtabliſht ones.

P. 26. *In Mr.* P's. *Judgment* (ſays the Bp.) *they muſt be all hirelings and Hypocrites, and the Bp. himſelf need not look far for ſuch*

——*he*

——*he is too ſenſibly inſtructed in this affair* (ſays Mr. *P.*) *for a parting blow.*—— (And in a few lines after the Bp. adds thus) *the Bp. mean-while for himſelf hereby Summon's* W. P. *to appear before God ſhortly at his Tribunal to anſwer for his Cenſuring him as a mercenary, an hireling, and an Hypocrite.*

Anſw. We might with much more reaſon return the like Summons to the Bp. for his great abuſe of *W. P.* in particular, and the *Quakers* in general, as we have ſhewn, and by this Inſtance we find he reſolves to hold out unfair to *W. P.* to the end, in laying down words in a different character as *W. P's.* tho' they are none of his directly, and not only ſo, but adding with a break between ſome words Eight pages diſtant to anſwer his purpoſe, without giving any notice thereof, therefore we ſhall Cite *W. P's.* Words in both places as they lye in his *Defence.* Thus (*p.* 122.) *If he* (*i. e.* the Bp.) 'Hath any ſhot left againſt mercenary 'Religioniſt he may not miſs the mark 'next time, but make it his main aim, end, 'and ſtudy to expoſe Hirelings and Hypo-'crites in their proper colours; and ſome 'are of opinion, he need not go far to find 'too many of them. *Again, p.* 130. I can-'not pretend to tell the Bp. what tribe of 'Men in Chriſtendom it is, that have long

'made

'made gain their godlineſs, and the pre-
'tence thereof their worldly inheritance,
'ſince he has been, ſo much more ſenſibly
'inſtructed in this affair then my ſelf.

Pray Reader compare theſe Citations with what the Bp. has laid down as *W. P's.* and ſee if they do not differ, but ſince the Bp. by falſifying *W. P's.* words, *p.* 122. and by ſo doing apply'd them directly to himſelf, which is plain *W. P.* did not unleſs the Bp. be included in the number [*too many*] and ſince 'tis very plain as *W. P.* hath told him, *p.* 130. he is more ſenſibly inſtructed in getting worldly inheritance for a Spiritual conſideration then *W. P.* is. We ſay ſince the caſe is thus it will lie upon the Bp. to rectifie and give ſatisfaction for his unfairneſs (in this as well as other Citations, *&c.*) as well as to clear himſelf of *W. P's.* laſt aſſertion (by way of compariſon) in getting, *&c.* As to making Gain Godlineſs, they were in return to the Bp's. ſuggeſting the *Quakers* ſuch a People in his *Teſtimony.*

Ibid. (26.) The Bp. proceeds thus, he (*i. e.* the Bp.) *is further bold to tell the World that both he and diverſe of his brethren with him in a certain City laboured in the Miniſtry both day and night, when they had neither Lands nor Tythes, nor other Revenues to ſupport them* —— *And did feed their Flock.*

—— *That*

——*That the very perſons or others of their party, who now call that ſpoiling, which is but making ſome of their party pay a ſmall pittance of Legal Dues, were at that time in power at Court or otherwiſe; and inſtead of Preaching, were Directors of publick Councils for no good or much miſchief.*

Anſw. If the Bp. could have boldly told us, that he and his brethren fed their Flock freely, and at ſuch a time when they could have compelled People to pay *Tythes* and other maintainance, but would not do it, becauſe 'twas no Goſpel maintainance, we ſay if he could have thus told us it would indeed have been not only *bold* but well *told* too; but to tell the world he fed his Flock without *Tythes*, &c. in a time of War, when 'twas not in his power to get them, we think by ſuch his boldneſs, he will merit no great Commendations; and as to ſtaying with his Flock in a time of danger, 'twas but his reaſonable duty ſo to do, if it were only for his being largely pay'd (by them) before. We will not ſay he would have left them if he could, but he knows that unleſs he had gon off in the begining of the troubles, 'twas almoſt next to impoſſible to get away afterwards; and certain it is many who did ſtay would gladly have gon afterwards if they could, whether he was one of that number he beſt knows.

knows. Next as to our not *paying a ſmall pittance of Legal Dues* (as he calls them.) We anſwer 'tis for conſcience ſake we deny ſuch payments, as not believing *Tythes*, &c. due to a Goſpel Miniſtry, and as to the Legality of them, we diſpute not the point, but ſay ſince he demands and takes them for a *Spiritual conſideration*, he ought to prove his right to *Tythes*, &c. by a *divine Sanction*, as well as inſiſt upon the Legality of them.

Now to the laſt part of his charge, where he inſinuates that *ſome Preachers amongſt us were great at Court or otherwiſe, and inſtead of Preaching, were Directors of publick Councils for no good or much miſchief.*

Anſw. This charge (as a parting blow to ſpeak in the Bp's. words) as it is untrue ſo it is equally unfair, not only in his being ſilent as to the perſon or perſons that were ſuch, *no good or much miſchief Directors*, (if he knew them) but alſo in not telling the World what that *no good* or *much miſchief* was, ſuch did, that hereby the matter being known, the World might judg, whether it was criminal or not, and if particular Perſons were guilty they might bear their own blame, and the Innocent be cleared, but neither of theſe the Bp. has done, for a good reaſon (no doubt) becauſe he could not do it. But the Bp. perhaps thought

thought this general and hidden way beſt to ſerve his end, which we cannot believe was any other then thereby to calumniate the *Quakers* in general; all the pretence that we can ſuppoſe for this charge is, that ſome few (perhaps not above a dozen at moſt in all the Nation, if ſo many) of our Friends were (very much againſt their minds) nominated *Common Counſel-men*, and ſome of them *Aldermen* in particular incorporale Towns, as likewiſe at the ſame time were far greater numbers of other Proteſtants (which tho' a crime in us yet none in them with the Bp.) And as to preachers, we do not believe there was at moſt above two or three in the Nation of that number it ſelf, nay we know but of one. But that either preachers or hearers were *great at Court* at all, or *Directors of publick Councils*, as the Bp. ſaith, we utterly deny, unleſs he will call: *W. B.* one, who yet was no Preacher, nor indeed was he in unity with us. On the contrary we are bold to tell the World (as the Bp. did,) we think with leſs reaſon) and which we ſhould not have done but that it is extorted from us on this occaſion, that the *Quakers* in moſt parts of the Nation did contribute large Summs to the relief of *diſtreſſed Proteſtants* and never failed to do them good on all occaſions as it lay in their power.

But

But why's the Bp. ſo loud and hiddenly ſmiting the *Quakers*, we think he might have been ſilent in ſuch a charge above many others, ſince no *Quaker* in *Ireland* was ſo high a *Director* (to give his own words) as a *Parliament Man*, which the Bp. was in thoſe times, which we do not reflect upon him for, yet he that was ſuch, he that writ the *Specimen of Loyalty* and ſo largely aſſerted the Right of that Goverment, to be undoubted; and he that publickly reprehended or ſilenced a Clergy Man in *Cork* for a Certain ſhortneſs in his Office, the better to expreſs his great Loyalty, might have forborn this undue as well as untrue charge againſt the *Quakers*. We do not aggravate the matter, otherwiſe we could be more particular, as to the two laſt, nor indeed had we mentioned any of them but that we were led to it by his hidden reflection.

Ibid. 26. He (*i. e.* the Bp.) *never perſecuted Quakers*, &c.——to which we anſwer, as we are plain where he injures us, ſo we will not be unjuſt where he deſerves praiſe; we do confeſs we never heard he did, and tho' perſecution be diſagreable to the very nature of Chriſtianity, yet the contrary is commendable in the Bp. ſince ſome, while in their power, have been greatly guilty of perſecution, and altho' this controverſie has happened

happened with the Bp. yet we may juſtly ſay, 'twas neither deſired nor ſought for by us, and had the Bp. continued to be as eaſie with his *Pen* as he was in not perſecuting the *Quakers* otherways, there had been no occaſion for all this publick controverſy: the Bp. tells us, *p.* 26. *he hindered a certain perſon from publiſhing Memoirs of Mr.* P's. *Life, of his turning Quaker, and of his buſineſs at ſaint Omers*, &c.

Anſw. So far as the Bp. really did ſo in tenderneſs to the good name of *W. P.* it is to be commended in him (tho' ſuch Memoirs were ever ſo untrue) However we tell the Bp. whatever his mind was heretofore, yet the giving ſuch a ſlant of being at *St. Omers* don't now look very kind: We farther tell the Bp. that *W. P.* is no ſtranger to malitious lies and forgeries, both upon himſelf in particular as well as upon the *Quakers* in general; and as to the true reaſon of *W. P's.* turning *Quaker*, whatever Malice may frame or ſuggeſt, yet we think no conſiderate and Impartial Man can poſſibly believe, he had any other motive or conſideration to his turning Quaker, but the good of his Soul, while the way to *Quakeriſm* (ſo called) is ſo very contrary to the greatneſs, Honour, and preferment with other ſuch like worldly conſiderations (which are moſt commonly the motives to great

great Changes) and that at the ſame time *W. P.* turned Quaker, he turned his back upon all theſe things.

Next as to the buſineſs of *St. Omers*: This Inſtance ſhews what ſort of Memoirs theſe were like to be. This Story is as old and thread bare as it is falſe, and if lying charges and ſtories were proofs *W. P.* was not only at *St. Omers* but had received Orders at *Rome*, and had dyed a *Papiſt* many years paſt: But why do not all his falſe Accuſers prove his being there, by aſſigning a credible witneſs or witneſſes, who ſaw him there, or ſome way or other demonſtrate he was there? No that was never done, and indeed for a good reaſon, becauſe it could not in truth be done. Now this blind ſtory, we confront by a publick Print, written by *W. P.* in anſwer to a friend of his, who importunately deſired him for ſatisfaction to the credulous, and ſuch who knew not *W. P.* that he would in a Publick maner anſwer that among other lying ſtories; the Letter is Dated---- *October*, 1688. wherein *W. P.* makes return to thoſe lying Aſperſions, *p.* 11. and Solemnly declares that he was not only no *Jeſuit* or *Papiſt*, but that he never was at *St. Omers in all his Life, nor did he ſo much as know, or ever correſpond with any one there.* Here *W. P.* put it upon the teſt, his lying Ene-

mies had then a fair opportunity (if they could) to prove him a Lyer, and in ſo doing would have had good ground to ſuſpect him a *Papiſt* too.

Ibid. p. 26. and 27. The Bp. concludes his Book, firſt, telling of *W. P's. vile Treatment*, and calls his *Defence an unhandſome piece*; then proceeds with a Prayer *that God will forgive all to Mr.* P. *and his brethren, and beſtow upon them a Spirit of true Faith, meekneſs and peace, of heavenly mindedneſs, Charity, Mortification, and all the Graces they pretend to; and that their hearts may be one day found as void of Errour, Pride, Scorn, and peeviſh rancour, as Mr.* P's. *Book is full of the expreſſions of them all.* Thus ends the Bp.

Anſw. As to the *vile Treatment* and the Expreſſions of *Errour, Pride, Scorn, peeviſh rancour*, &c. the Bp. tells us is in *W. P's. unhandſom piece*; we ſay they are hard words, and ſooner ſaid then proved, and the Reader may remember, the Bp. throughout his Reply has been readier at charges then proofs, moſt of which (we think) has in the end fallen upon himſelf inſtead of *W. P.* as we have ſhewn; and in this caſe we do deny what the Bp. hath aſſerted, and for *Umpirage* (in the matter) refer our ſelves to the Impartial Reader, who have been moſt guilty of theſe and ſuch like expreſſions, *W. P.* in his *Defence*, or the Bp. in his *Reply*.

Next

Next as to the Bp's. *Prayer.* If the Bp. had been more ſparing to *miſrepreſent, villifie*, and *abuſe W. P.* and the *Quakers*; then he hath been, it might have come with leſs ſuſpition of its reality; but we think its next to impoſſible that any Man who endeavours to *abuſe* and *miſrepreſent* another, can at the ſame time *Pray truly* and *heartily* for him: And as to thoſe Graces the Bp. mentions, tho' on the one hand we will not boaſt of them, yet through the mercy and goodneſs of God, ſome of us can in humility of Soul ſay, we have in meaſure witneſſed the work of *Mortification* in our Souls, through the Spirit of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt.

And now to conclude; We can in ſincerity ſay we have not, according to the beſt of our underſtandings, either *miſrepreſented* the Bp. or *wilfully overlookt* his ſenſe, but ſo far as we underſtood the Import of his words, and where the force of his Arguments lay, we have as truly ſtated them, and thereupon anſwered with uprightneſs; and whether we have thus done by the Bp: and he hath done ſo by *W. P.* or not, is left to the Impartial Reader, and ſo we conclude this Rejoynder.

Cork, the 15. of the
11. *Month*, 1699.

T. W.
N. H.

The *E N D.*

THE Author's Abſence from the Preſs hath occaſioned ſeveral Errors in the Printing, the moſt Material whereof are here Corrected, and thoſe of leſſer Note which have eſcaped, the Reader is deſired to Correct with his Pen, or over-look.

ERRATA.

PAge 1. line 6. for himſelf, thanks. Read, himſelf ———,thanks. *l.* 15. abated, and *r.* abated———, and. p. 13. *l.* 2. Doctrine, by *r.* Doctrine,——— by. p. 14. *l.* 1. *r.* Firſt Impreſſion. p. 19. *l.* 13. blot out. *Heb.* 10. 35. p. 24. *l.* 21. deny. *r.* deny, *&c.* p. 39. *l.* 1. blot out then. p. 53. *l.* 1. (p. 9.) *r.* (p. 14.) p. 61. *l.* this. *r.* thus. p. 62. *l.* 11. Bp's. *r.* Bp. p. 66. *l.* 9. *W. P's. r. W. P.* p. 83. *l.* 11. blot out and. p. 86. *l.* 25. (p 29.) *r.* (p. 57.) p. 90. *l.* 23. 1 *John.* 1. 12. *r.* 1 *John* 1. 1. p. 93. *l.* 23. love. *r.* leave. p. 100. *l.* 2. what have. *r.* what Rule have. p. 106. *l.* 7. *Matt.* 43. *r. Matt.* 73. p. 110. *John* 5. 8. *r. John* 3. 8. p. 126. *l.* ult. blot out appearance. *Ibid.* ſecond coming. *r.* ſecond outward coming. p. 131. *l.* 2 and 3. blot out (which we do not.) *l.* 4. the occaſion. *r.* on the occaſion. p. 133. *l.* 2. *viz.* no. *r. viz.* that no. p. 143 *l.* 8. *Pſal.* 66. 17. *r. Pſal.* 66. 16. p. 145. *l.* 14. (p, 54.) *r.* (p. 80.) *l.* 18. blot. p. *l.* 19. *verſ. r. verſes.* p. 148. *l.* 29 being. *r.* been. p. 151. *l.* 2. blot out. 1 *Cor.* 6. 19. p. 159. *l.* 18. ſtrongly. *r.* ſtrangely. p. 161. *l.* 15. excepted. *r.* accepted. p. 163. *l.* 11. *Matt.* 6. 21. *r. Matt.* 6 31. p. 170. *l.* 7. as a Mercenary. *r.* as Mercenary.